





UNIVERSITY  
OF FLORIDA  
LIBRARIES



GREENE & Co.  
New Printing and Bookbinding  
10, CLARE STREET,  
DUBLIN.

BOUND AT  
D. T. DOHERTY'S,  
*Stationery, Lithographing,*  
PRINTING & BOOKBINDING WORKS  
58, Ann St., BELFAST.





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015







# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal, under Episcopal Sanction.

---

THIRD SERIES.

VOLUME XIV.—1893.

“Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.”

“As you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome.”

*Ex Dictis S. Patricii, Book of Armagh, fol. 9.*

DUBLIN :  
BROWNE & NOLAN, NASSAU-STREET.  
1893.

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.



*Nihil Obstat.*

GIRALDUS MOLLOY, S.T.D.,

CENSOR DEP.

*Imprimatur.*

✠ GULIELMUS,

*Archiep. Dublin., Hiberniae Primas.*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Adrian IV. to Henry II., The Privilege of. By Rev. N. Murphy, P.P.	162
A Few Thoughts on the Confession and Absolution of Children. By Rev. Denis Flynn	805
Alfred Tennyson. By Rev. John Clancy	16, 136
"Alleluia." By Rev. F. E. Gilliat Smith	337
A Mediæval Compendium of Theology. By Rev. W. H. Kent, O.S.C.	793
A Plea for the Study of Archaeology. By Wilfred Dallow, M.R.S.A.I.	1004
Australia, The Church in: The Irish Abroad. By Rev. Michael Phelan	33, 498, 673
Birthplace of St. Patrick. By Rev. Albert Barry, C.S.S.R.	1122
Blessed Juliana of Cornillon and Corpus Christi. By M. H. Allies	1010
Catechistic Work, The Nature of. By Rev. W. Whitty	150
Christianity in North America before the Coming of Columbus. By James Coleman, M.R.S.A.I.	888
Church Abroad, The: The Irish in Australia. By Rev. Michael Phelan	498, 673
Confraternities, Our. By Rev. M. Geoghegan, C.S.S.R.	234
Confession and Absolution of Children, A few Thoughts on the. By Rev. Denis Flynn	805
"Confessione Parvulorum De." By Rev. J. Lennon, M.S.S.	266
<i>Contemporary Review, The</i> , on the Necessity of the Temporal Power. By A. Hinsley, B.A.	441
<b>Correspondence :—</b>	
Adrian IV., The "Bull" of	283
Adrian IV. to Henry II., The Privilege of	377
Holy Family, Confraternity of the	477
"Missa Quotidiana," The First Prayer in the	475, 662
Most Rev. Dr. Butler, Archbishop of Cashel	82, 275
Sen-Patrick	944, 1050
Dangerous Reading. By Very Rev. J. J. Canon Kelly	306
De Mazenod, Mgr., Founder of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. By Rev. T. B. Scannell	414
Deportation of the Irish to the West Indies in the Seventeenth Century. By Rev. D. Murphy, S.J.	609, 744
Dictionary of Hymns, The New. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	589
Did Moses Write the Pentateuch? By Rev. Joseph M'Rory	45, 289
Diocese of Elphin, The, 1671-1717. By Rev. J. J. Kelly	1086

**Documents:—**

Altar, Case of Doubt as to a Consecrated	- - - -	663
"Benedictio in Articulo Mortis," Various Questions regarding the	-	855
Canonization of Jesuit Martyrs, Decree regarding the Process of	-	90
Canonization of Dominican Martyrs, Decree regarding the Process of	- - - -	91
Communion is Administered out of Mass	- - - -	188
Genuflection of the Clergy in Course of a Function	- - - -	188
Holy Family, Pious Association of the	- - - -	952
Holy Family, Rules for the Pious Association of the	- - - -	378
Holy Family, Solution of Questions Regarding the Association of the	-	856
Impediment of Affinity, The	- - - -	954
Leo XIII., Encyclical Letter of His Holiness, on the Rosary	-	946
Mass of the Sacred Heart	- - - -	188
Mass or Commemoration of the Anniversary of the Consecration of the Bishop of the Diocese	- - - -	188
Mass, The Solemn, in Celebration of the Anniversary of the Election of the Pope, or the Consecration of the Ordinary	- -	188
Mass, Position of the Priest when saying the Last Gospel at	-	188
Matrimonial Impediments, The Power of the Ordinary to Dispense in Certain	- - - -	855
Mixed Marriages in Malta	- - - -	88
Office "Tempore Paschali," The Commemoration of the Cross in the Roman Ritual, May it be followed when differing from the special ritual in use in the diocese?	- - - -	188
Special Office of St. Ita, extended to the Diocese of Waterford	-	953
Votive Office of the Immaculate Conception	- - - -	188
Votive Office in Lent, A	- - - -	188
Vestments of the Sacred Ministers at Benediction of the Most Holy Sacraments	- - - -	664
Drink Disease, The Irish. By Rev. D. O'Brien	- - - -	614
Ethnological Table of Moses, The. By Rev. J. A. Howlett, o.s.b.	-	213
Glendalough in the Twelfth Century. By Rev. James Manning, p.p.	351, 636	
Gospel of St. John, Some Remarks on the. By Rev. John Carroll, p.p.	-	396
"Hell, Happiness in," Mr. Mivart on. By Rev. John S. Vaughan	-	1
Hell, On the Mitigation of Punishment in. By Rev. R. F. Clarke, s.j.	-	481
Holy Eucharist, Thoughts on the. By Rev. John S. Vaughan	- -	335
"Horæ Liturgicæ;" or, Studies on the Missal. By Rev. E. L. Taunton	- - - - 127, 255, 427, 710, 820, 1018,	1096
Hymns, The New Dictionary of. By Orby Shipley, m.a.	- -	589
Inebriates, The Treatment of. By Rev. James Halpin	- -	788
Irish Abroad, The: The Church in Australia. By Rev. Michael Phelan	- - - - - 33, 498,	473
Irish Intemperance: Its Causes and Remedy. By Rev. T. Dunne	-	919
Irish Drink Disease, The. By Rev. D. O'Brien, Dublin	- -	614
Is there a "Limbus Paganorum"? By Rev. R. F. Clarke, s.j.	-	97
Jubilee Year in Masonic Rome. By Rev. A. O'Loughlin	- -	769



# Contents.

V

PAGE

Jupiter, The Planet. By Rev. F. Lennon	- - -	112
Layman's Prayer-book in the Middle Ages, The. By Orby Shipley, M.A.		835
"Limbus Paganorum," Is there a? By Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J.	-	97

## Liturgical Questions:—

Altar Stone, The	- - -	471
Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament	- - -	656, 854
Canonry, The Appointment to a	- - -	937
Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions, The	- - -	847
Cincture, The Method of Knotting the	- - -	187
Crucifixes, Indulgences for the "Via Crucis"	- - -	660
Crucifixes, Indulged	- - -	852, 1044, 1137
Date of the Anniversary of the Consecration of a Cathedral Church		936
Divine Office, Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin in the	- -	474
Domestic and other Prelates who are not Bishops, Exposition of the		
Insignia, Dress, and Privileges of	- - -	753
Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament	- - -	1134
Feast of the Titular of a Church, The	- - -	940
Holy Family, Granting a New Office and Mass in honour of the	-	1040
Holy Family, The Association of the	- - -	555
Holy Week, The Ceremonies of	- - -	471
Mass, Low: Should the Celebrant take Holy Water when entering the Church?	- - -	81
Mass, Low, The Number of Candles at	- - -	274
Mass, Low, The Prayer to be said after	- - -	471
"Missa Quotidiana," The first Prayer in the (see also "Correspondence")	- - -	273, 366
Plenary Indulgence, "The Visit to a Church," &c., for gaining a	-	185
Primary and Secondary Feasts, The New Decree affirming the		
Distinction between	- - -	1037
Questions regarding the Stations of the Cross	- - -	1132
Roman Ordo, Altering the	- - -	941
Sodality of the Sacred Heart, Questions regarding the Erection of a		1042
"Suffragia" of the Office, and the Prayer "A Cunctis" of the		
Mass, The	- - -	77
Martyrs, Some of our. By Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P.	- - -	978
Mass of the Apostles, The. By Rev. R. O'Kennedy,	- -	876, 1074
Mgr. De Mazenod, Founder of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. By		
Rev. J. B. Scannell	- - -	414
Mr. Mivart on "Happiness in Hell." By Rev. John S. Vaughan	-	1
Mystical Sense of Scripture, The. By Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P.	-	512
Nature of Catechistic Work, The. By Rev. W. Whitty	- -	150
New Dictionary of Hymns, The. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	- -	589

## Notices of Books:—

Acts of the English Martyrs, 288; A Christian Apology, 288; All Hallow's Manual, 93; Aislinge Meic-Conglinne: The Vision of MacConglinne, 95; A Mixed Marriage, 863; Analysis of the

NOTICES OF BOOKS—*continued*.

Gospels of the Sundays of the Year, 766 ; A Sin and its Atonement, 384 ; Birthday Souvenir, 767 ; Brendaniana : St. Brendan the Voyager, in Story and Legend, 857 ; Carmina Mariana, 572 ; Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals, The, 479 ; Ceremonies of Ordination, with the Ceremonies of the Mass, Private and Solemn, in which Orders are Conferred, 665 ; Donegal Highlands, The, 1054 ; Encyklopädie und Methodologie der Theologie, 95 ; Fasti Mariani, Sive Calendarium Festorem Sanctae Mariae Virginis Deiparae, 954 ; Harry Dee ; or, Making It Out, 479 ; History of Clare and the Dalcassian Clans of Tipperary, Limerick, and Galway, 566 ; History of the Irish National Pilgrimage to Rome ; or, Notes by the Way, 670 ; History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Kilmacduagh, The, 763 ; History and Antiquities of Kilkenny, County and City, 860 ; Holy Face of Our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ, 285 ; Illustrated Bible History of the Old and New Testaments, 284 ; Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars, 570 ; Letters of the late Father George Porter, S.J., 287 ; Life of Hugh Roe O'Donnell, The, 285 ; Life of Dr. O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, 573 ; Life of Father Charles, C.P., The, 762 ; Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of Orestes A. Brownson, 764 ; Manual of Church History, A, 382 ; Manuale de Indulgentiis, 671 ; Mémoires, Reminiscences, Conférences, 382 ; Moments before the Tabernacle, 192 ; Œuvres de St. Francis de Sales, 478 ; Physical System of St. Thomas, The, 859 ; Poetical Works of "Lageniensis," The, 1138 ; Religion of the Future, The, and other Essays, 1142 ; Sancti Thomae Aquinatis, O.P., Doctrina de Cooperatione Dei cum omni Natura creata praesertim libera, sen S. Thomas praedeterminationis physicae ad omnem Actionem Creatam adversarius. Responsio ad R. P. F. A. M. Dummermuth, O.P., praedeterminationis physicae defensorem. Script Victor Frins 960 ; Secret Service under Pitt, 958 ; Servite Manual, 192 ; Short History of Ireland, A, 765 ; Socialism Exposed and Refuted, 94 ; St. Paul, his Missions, 93 ; Succat, The Story of Sixty Years of the Life of St. Patrick, 574 ; Tabulae Systematicae et Synopticae Totius Summae Theologiae S. Thomas Aquinatis, 768 ; Tales from the German, 576 ; The Monk's Pardon, 862 ; The Witness of the Saints ; or, the Saints and the Church, 864 ; Theocracy and the Law of National Caducity, The, 383 ; Theologiae Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum, 384 ; Thirty-two Instructions for the Month of May and for the Feasts of the Blessed Virgin, 191 ; True Wayside Tales, 192 ; Vatican and the Kingdom of Italy, The, 667.

On the Mitigation of Punishment in Hell. By Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J.	481
Palestine in 1893. By Rev. F. M. Ryan	705
Pentateuch, Did Moses Write the? By Rev. Joseph M'Rory	45, 289
Policy of the Pope, The. By A. Hinsley, B.A.	316
Privilege of Adrian IV. to Henry II., The. By Rev. N. Murphy, P.P.	162
Ros-mic-Treoin. By John Cullen	724, 928

Sen Patrick. By Rev. Albert Barry, c.s.s.b.	-	-	-	-	627
Sen Patrick: Who He Was Not. By Very Rev. Sylvester Malone, M.B.I.A.	-	-	-	-	815
Socialism: Its Progress and Prospects. By Rev. Thomas A. Finlay, s.j.	-	-	-	-	961
Superstitions, Some Derived From Paganism During the Middle Ages. By Rev. F. E. Gilliat Smith.	-	-	-	-	732
Some of our Martyrs. By Rev. Reginald Walsh, o.p.	-	-	-	-	978
Some Remarks on the Gospel of St. John. By Rev. John Carroll, p.p.	-	-	-	-	396
St. Dymphna of Gheel. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	-	-	-	-	577
St. Fintan of Rheinau. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	-	-	-	-	385
St. Fridolin of Seckingen. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	-	-	-	-	193
St. Gall, Apostle of Allemannia. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	-	-	-	-	1057
St. Patrick, Birthplace of. By Rev. Albert Barry, c.s.s.b.	-	-	-	-	1122
St. Rumold of Mechlin. By Rev. J. F. Hogan	-	-	-	-	58
St. Thomas, Tennyson and. By Rev. John A. Howlett, o.s.b.	-	-	-	-	689
Temporal Power, <i>The Contemporary Review</i> on the Necessity of the. By Rev. A. Hinsley, B.A.	-	-	-	-	441
Tennyson, Alfred. By Rev. John Clancy	-	-	-	-	16, 136
Tennyson and St. Thomas. By Rev. John A. Howlett, o.s.b.	-	-	-	-	689
Theology, A Mediæval Compendium of. By Rev. W. H. Kent, o.s.c.	-	-	-	-	793
<b>Theological Questions —</b>					
Absolution from Reserved Sins	-	-	-	-	547
Baptism of Adults, The	-	-	-	-	651
Fast and Abstinence at Sea	-	-	-	-	172
Masses, The Celebration of Certain	-	-	-	-	651
Mass in Private Houses	-	-	-	-	750
Original Mysteries of Religion, The	-	-	-	-	751
"Pulling" Horses at Races, and Betting	-	-	-	-	175, 271, 461
Thoughts on the Holy Eucharist. By Rev. John S. Vaughan	-	-	-	-	535, 865
Treatment of Inebriates, The. By Rev. James Halpin	-	-	-	-	788
Who Sen Patrick Was Not. By Very Rev. Sylvester Malone, M.B.I.A.	-	-	-	-	815
Wool, William G. and the Catholic Revival. By Evelyn Mordaunt.	-	-	-	-	901
Ximenes, and the Conversion of the Moors. By Rev. F. Andrew, o.s.f.	-	-	-	-	619





# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1893.

## MR. MIVART ON "HAPPINESS IN HELL."

"Non est judicium Dei leniendum."

"Misericordia nostra erga delinquentes nihil eis prodesse potest, sicut nec eis  
desse potest sententie nostre severitas. *Multum vero nobis obesset, si ob inaudita*  
*sententia delinquentes Sacerdotes pertraheretur aliquid defendere.*"

*Theol. Wacchi., Tomus vii., § 110.*

"HAPPINESS IN HELL" is the strange title of an essay by Mr. St. George Mivart, published in the December issue of the *Nineteenth Century*. Throughout some twenty pages, Mr. Mivart strives to destroy the old traditional, patristical, and scriptural idea of hell, which he finds has grown distasteful, in this age of culture, refinement, and general sensitiveness. "Not only the sentiment of our day, but what we take to be its more highly evolved moral perceptions," he says, "are shocked at the doctrine that countless myriads of mankind will burn for ever in hell."

It is much to be regretted that these "highly evolved moral perceptions," of which Mr. Mivart makes so much, do not lead men to be more shocked at the prevailing vices of the day (*i.e.*, the *causes* of eternal punishment), rather than at the punishment itself. If the world were a little more shocked at the atrocious sins and shocking crimes that are constantly committed in its midst, and a little less addicted to calling black white, and darkness light, and, with fair words, "sugaring" over the devil himself, there would, perhaps, be less anxiety, as there would certainly be less need, to explain away the terrible threats of Holy Scripture, and to convert hell into a sort of glorified brothel, gin-palace, and gaming-hall combined, where drunkards, adulterers, murderers,

and perpetrators of unnatural crime will have a rattling good time of it, and no end of fun; not such, indeed, as persons of high culture and refinement would enjoy, but eminently suited to the tastes of the immoral, licentious, and cut-throat fraternity that exists in every great city. And the reason is plain, for as Mr. Mivart says:—"As they have by their actions constructed their own hell, they may therein find a certain harmony with their own mental condition." (Page 916.) So far from this hideous collection of human scoundrels and assassins—the scum and off-scourings of every tavern and brothel on earth—being, as is generally represented, a source of inexpressible torture and terror to each other, Mr. Mivart assures us that "it may be, they (*i.e.*, the positively damned) seek and meet with the society of souls like-minded with themselves; and, as it were, together hug their chains, *esteeming as preferable*<sup>1</sup> activities and desires which had been their choice and solace upon earth."

Such a picture as Mr. Mivart draws in the above words, would, indeed, suggest heaven rather than hell to the mind of the average drunkard and debauchee, whose idea of absolute bliss may generally be represented by visions of unlimited beer, "baccy," and abandoned women. Here, it must be borne in mind, Mr. Mivart is not referring to the lot of unbaptized children, or to savages who have lived up to their lights, but "to the multitude of the *positively* damned." (Page 916.)

Mr. Mivart has given what he conceives to be the teaching of the Church; so, perhaps, it may not be too much, Mr. Editor, to ask that we may be accorded a like privilege. We take it, that all human beings departing this life, may be classified under one of the following headings:—

THE HUMAN RACE	CHILDREN	{ (and others who have died before attaining the use of reason)	{ Baptized—go to Heaven (1)
			{ Unbaptized—go to Limbo <sup>2</sup> (2)
	ADULTS	{ Baptized ..	{ Dying in a state of grace—go to Heaven (3)
			{ Dying in actual mortal sin—go to Hell (4)
		{ Unbaptized	{ Never having committed actual sin—go to Limbo (5)
			{ Dying in actual mortal sin—go to Hell (6)
		{ Sacramentally	{ Who have sinned, but have so repented as to obtain forgiveness go to Heaven (7)

Numbers (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6), we take to be certain.

Numbers (5) and (7) we consider as *sententiae probabiliores*.

<sup>1</sup> The italics throughout this paper are our own.

<sup>2</sup> "Limbus patrum pars superior inferni esse videatur."—*Vide* St. Thom., Sup., p. 3, q. lxi., a. v.



With regard to unbaptized children, who have never been capable of any personal sin, the opinion of the Church is undoubtedly merciful.

Innocent III. says :—" Poena originalis peccati est car-entia visionis Dei; actualis vero peccati poena est gehennae perpetuae cruciatus." Here it is evidently taught that original sin excludes the vision of God, but that nothing less than actual and wilful sin can kindle the flames of positive pain.

Again—as a learned Jesuit<sup>1</sup> lays down :—" Deus neminem punit poena positiva sensus, nisi propter culpam personalem et propria voluntate commissam ;" he furthermore adds, that " poena physice propria, qualis est sensus, videtur tantum congruere culpae personali, seu physice propria voluntate commissae, ut servetur inter culpam et poenam proportio." This doctrine seems to be implied also in the usage of the Church, which imposes a penance on penitents in the Sacrament of Penance, but none on those who are regenerated in Holy Baptism.

Mr. Mirart writes, on page 908 :—" To think that God could punish men, however slightly, still less, could damn them for all eternity, for anything that they have not the full power to avoid, &c., is a doctrine so monstrous and revolting, that stark Atheism is plainly a preferable belief." This expression of righteous indignation is, of course, all very well; yet, in things spiritual, as well as natural, children often suffer on account of their parents' follies or sins. A son may suffer perpetual poverty, because his father was a spendthrift; or an *innocent* daughter may be ostracized from society, or even die of grief, because her mother was hanged for murder. Thus God permits children to bear, at least in part, the penalty of their parents' crime.

Indeed, God would seem to allow children *guilty of nothing but original sin*, to suffer even in this life; and if in this life, why not in the next? Do not children suffer pain? Are they not liable to disease? Does not death often cut short their career before they have ever committed any actual sin?

<sup>1</sup> R. P. H. Kilber.

And is not death one of the penalties of sin? and if death, then also all that leads to it—the sickness, the fevers, the agonies, which culminate in death. Hence there are theologians and fathers who have maintained that even original sin carries with it some degree of pain and discomfort, though the *sententia probabilior* is undoubtedly that no positive pain is inflicted, but only privative. We may all safely say with St. Augustine: "*Sine baptismo parvuli morientes, quo non eant, scio; quo eant, nescio.*"<sup>1</sup>

An unbaptized adult, who has never been guilty of positive sin, is evidently much in the same position as an unregenerated infant. The only question would be, whether such a being could remain in inculpable ignorance of God. We are inclined to doubt it, for such a man certainly does all that can be expected of him; and "*facienti quod est in se, Deus non negabit gratiam,*" is a theological axiom. This, we take it, is still more certainly true of class (7) in the above table.<sup>2</sup> Take the case of a poor pagan, living, say, in the South Sea Islands, who should fall into grievous personal sin. He may, indeed, obtain forgiveness, if he be able to bring himself into the proper dispositions. But would it be possible to excite an act of contrition, *such as would wash away his sin*, and yet, which would not at the same time confer on him the baptism of desire, and the consequent supernatural grace of God? We think not. And if we judge rightly, then such a soul would not go to hell at all, but would ascend to heaven itself; not, indeed, as a pagan, but as a true and real child of God.

Class (5), which embraces all those who have acted up to their lights and followed the dictates of conscience, but to whom the Gospel had never been preached, are, as long as they remain in invincible ignorance of God, St. Thomas teaches, to be classed among unbaptized infants. They go to Limbo, and pass their existence free from actual pain.

<sup>1</sup> L. 2, de *Grat.*, c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Aliquis per virtutem Spiritus Sancti consequitur effectum baptismi, non solo sine baptismo aquae, sed etiam sine baptismo sanguinis, *inquantum scilicet alienus cor per Spiritum Sanctum movetur ad credendum, et diligendum Deum, et poenitendum de peccatis; unde etiam dicitur baptismus poenitentiae.*" (S. Th., pars 3, q. lxvi., a. xi.)

"Pro peccato originali puniuntur homines in limbo puerorum, ubi non est poena sensus."

Let us now advance to the point of greatest interest, and consider what is generally taught as to the condition of those souls who die in wilful mortal sin. Mr. Mivart informs us that he has not written "in the spirit of an advocate," a piece of information which is certainly not superfluous, considering the whole tenor of his paper.

He makes an admission on page 902, which is somewhat startling, considering the nature of his general contention. He writes that preachers and divines "taught plainly that there were eternally in hell unspeakable torments in addition to the state of loss. This was the unanimous teaching of saints and fathers—especially homilists—such as St. Gregory the Great, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and so many more that it would be useless to attempt to enumerate them here. There can be no question," he continues, "but that the Catholic Church is irrevocably committed to the doctrine that not only are the damned, damned for all eternity, but that their condition is least inadequately represented by images of the most extreme and varied torture."

So far from this *consensus*—this "unanimous teaching," to use his own expression—of preachers, divines, fathers, and theologians bringing conviction to the mind of Mr. Mivart, he calmly brushes them all aside, as he might so many troublesome midges, and explains away their words till there is hardly any meaning left to them. It would appear that these great theologians are mere rhetoricians, speaking for effect; artists, who lay on pigments to bring out contrasts! In plain English, they are not to be taken seriously. The difference between heaven and the most superlative form of natural happiness is so great, that they could not speak of this natural happiness as happiness at all, but were obliged to describe it as absolute misery. We fully agree to the first statement, but utterly deny the consequence, which is ridiculous. He says, "We are reduced to symbols so inadequate that words cannot adequately express their inadequacy." This is, of course, undeniable. But then he goes on to affirm that,



"The result is, that, in order to convey to the mind as practically serviceable an image as may be, of what such bliss and glory are, the only possible course has been to endeavour to depict them by contrast." He thus illustrates what he means. "If a painter has to depict, as best he may, a brightness which no pigment can approach, he is induced to attempt it by deepening shadows as much as his palette will admit—regretting all the time that he has no sables nearly black enough to convey, by contrast, a due appreciation of that unrepresentable brightness." Now, on this principle, in order to bring out the difference between the happiness of God Himself and that of the most favoured of His glorified creatures, *e.g.*, the highest angels and archangels of heaven, we ought to represent the celestial choirs as enduring every species of agony, torture, and despair. Indeed, there is actually a vastly greater distance between the absolutely infinite happiness of God and the subjectively finite happiness of the highest of His glorious angels, than between the *supernatural* happiness of one of the blessed and the *natural* happiness of any one of Mr. Mivart's damned clients.

If Mr. Mivart's extraordinary theory be true, then *he* may, indeed, speak of the expressions theologians use in describing hell, as merely artistic exaggerations. We would certainly call them unwarranted and outrageous lies. It is agreed on all sides that *Hell Opened to Christians* does not adequately represent the truth—but that is generally thought to be because (without any question of contrast) hell is considered to be *in se* so much worse than words can depict. Mr. Mivart surely cannot work himself into the belief that the words of the author which he quotes:—"Do not suppose I have exaggerated anything; I have failed indeed, in the opposite way," are meant to indicate "a natural happy state," and disagreeable only as compared to the indefinitely greater joys of heaven?

Let us quote a few sentences from fathers and theologians, as regards the state of "the multitude of the positively damned," whom Mr. Mivart thinks "may find (in hell) a certain kind of harmony with their own mental condition." (Page 916.

Infernus est locus *tormentorum*, ubi animas ignis perpetuo consumit.<sup>1</sup>

Voluntas eorum talis erit, ut habeant in se semper malignitatis suae supplementum, *supplicium, funem perire possint lenitatis afflictorum.*

Sine *fine* gaudenti vivunt sine spe veniae et misericordiae, quod est *miseria super miseriam.*

In lacu miseriae perennis, nihil videtur, nihil quod sentitur, nisi quod *displicet* nisi quod *offendit*, nisi quod *cruciat.*<sup>2</sup>

Est apud inferos summa tenebrarum obscuritas *immensa et perennitas acerbitas, infinita miseria et aeternitas.*<sup>3</sup>

Per millia millium annorum in inferno *cruciandi sunt miseri*, nec inde unquam liberandi.<sup>4</sup>

In inferno tunc desinet poena miserarum, quando gloria a sinu beatorum!<sup>5</sup>

St. Augustine, speaking of the condition of the lost, says :—

"Secunda mors dicitur, quia nec anima ibi vivere dicenda est, quae a vita Dei alienata erit; nec corpus, quod *aeternis doloribus* subjacebit."<sup>6</sup>

St. Gregory the Great also remarks that :—

"Recte inferni claustra, tenebrosa terra nominantur, quia quos puniendos accipiunt, *nequaquam poena transitoria vel phantastica imaginatione cruciant*, sed ultione solida perpetuae damnationi servant . . . Infernus et lacus dicitur, quia hos quos semel cepit, semper fluctuantes et trepidos tormentis circumfluentibus absorbet."

Innocent III. writes :—

"Omnis locus reprobus est poenalis, qui *semper secum deferunt cruciationem*, et ibique contra se tormentum incurrunt. Producam, inquit Ezech. xxviii. *ignem de medio tui, qui comedet te.* Ignis autem gehennae *semper deficiet*, et nunquam consumet; semper affliciet, et nunquam deficiet."<sup>7</sup>

Est apud inferos summa tenebrarum obscuritas, *immensa et perennitas acerbitas, infinita miseria et aeternitas.*<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hugo Card., *super Num.*, cap. xvi.

<sup>2</sup> St. Aug., *De Civitate Dei*, cap. vi.

<sup>3</sup> De Trip., *Habitac.*

<sup>4</sup> St. Bernardin, Senens., *super Apocal.*, cap. x.

<sup>5</sup> St. Ber., *Passio.*

<sup>6</sup> St. Bonav., *Sermon.*, l. de S. Mart.

<sup>7</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 28.

<sup>8</sup> *Mor.*, in *Joh* ix. 45.

<sup>9</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, lib. iii.

<sup>10</sup> St. Innoc. III., lib. iii., *De Cont. Mundi*, cap. 6.

*Tota hominis miseri in inferno substantia devorabitur incringuibilibus flammis : nec erit suppliciorum modus, vel intermissio sive finis.*<sup>1</sup>

*Ibi erit una hora gravior in poena, quam hic centum anni in gravissima poenitentia.*<sup>2</sup>

We can discover nothing in these, nor in the thousands of other similar passages that might be quoted, to suggest that the writers were merely artistically "deepening shadows," with a view of conveying "by contrast a due appreciation of the unrepresentable bliss" of heaven. Quite the contrary: we are perfectly well satisfied that they were expressing, so far as human language permitted, what they conceived to be the actual nature of hell's pains, without any idea of mere contrast.

An argument upon which Mr. Mivart lays considerable stress, is one which he draws from the doctrine that, "For every being, including, of course, all the damned, existence is better than annihilation." (Page 906.) Indeed he repeats the same idea no less than three distinct times.

"The existence of the very worst (in hell) is felt by him to be preferable to his non-existence. He does not, like so many wretches on earth, even desire the cessation of his being" (!) (Page 915.)

Again, at the bottom of page 918: "For the very worst, in spite of the positive and unceasing suffering before referred to, existence is acceptable, and is by them preferred to non-existence."

Now, we believe that Mr. Mivart's argument is entirely based upon a misconception. Absolutely speaking, "existence" must, of course, be something higher, and consequently more desirable, than "non-existence." Anything positive is ontologically of a higher order than what is purely negative: so that to say, as theologians do, even of a lost soul, "*Melius est sic esse quam non esse*," however startling at first sight, is, when rightly understood, to state the veriest truism—for *Omne ens est bonum* and *omne bonum est appetibile*. Existence *per se* is desired even by a lost soul; *i. e.*, existence

<sup>1</sup> Petrus Blesens.

<sup>2</sup> *De Imit. Chr.*, lib. i., c. 24.



proceeding from all question of pain and suffering. But pain is detested, and so far detested, that a damned soul would gladly sacrifice a real good, *i.e.*, existence, to rid itself of the torments of hell. This St. Thomas clearly explains (Sup. 3. q. cxviii., a. viii.) : "The damned do not desire annihilation for its own sake, since in itself it cannot be an object of desire ; considered, however, *as a means of escaping pain and misery*, annihilation may, and is, intensely desired by them." Hence he argues, in direct opposition to Mr. Mivart, that the lost *do* desire annihilation, "*secundum rationem deliberativam*;" and far more ("multo fortius") than the most miserable suicide on earth. They desire it, because, considered as a means of escaping torment, "*non esse accipit rationem boni*," and becomes at once an object of desire. Understood in that sense, St. Thomas concludes : "*Melius est damnatis non esse quam miseros esse*;" and, as the *Glossa Hieronymi* has it :— "*Melius est non-esse quam male esse*." Hence, so far as the damned are concerned, it is far better not to exist at all, than to exist in hell, since, as St. Thomas lays down in the same place, "*Damnatorum miseria omnem hujus mundi miseriam excedit*."

It may be prejudice, but in these theological matters we prefer St. Thomas's guidance to Mr. Mivart's ; especially when we find that even the Holy Spirit Himself assures us that the damned will seek destruction : "*Desiderabunt mori, et fugiat mors ab ijs*." <sup>1</sup> Referring to the damned, St. Bernardin Senens (*super* Apoc. xv.) exclaims : "*O mors, quam dulcis esses quibus tam amari fuisti. Te solam ibi (i.e., in hell) desideranter optabunt, qui te solam (i.e., on earth) vehementer oderunt*."

Another very curious contention of Mr. Mivart is, that the damned may even be unconscious that they are damned. He speaks (page 916) of "the possible unconsciousness of

<sup>1</sup> "And he opened the bottomless pit, &c. . . and in those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it, and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them." (Apoc. ix. 2-6.)

Mr. Mivart quotes St. Augustine ; so we add St. Thomas's explanation of his words :— "*Verbum Augustini est intelligendum quod non-esse non est per se eligibile, sed per accidens, inquantum scilicet est miserie terminativum*."

their state." And again (on page 905) he says: "It is even maintained that they may be unconscious of what their state really is."

Now, considering that everyone is —(1) to be present on the great Judgment Day, and (2) to hear his sentence, and (3) to be made sensible of the justice of his sentence, it is somewhat difficult to see how anyone can remain in ignorance of his state, especially if God, as St. Thomas teaches: "*In suo iudicio utitur conscientia peccantis quasi accusatore.*"<sup>1</sup>

Again, it would be difficult also to reconcile such a statement with the clear assurance of St. Paul: "*Veniat Dominus, qui et illuminabit abscondita tenebrarum, et manifestabit consilia cordium, et tunc laus erit unicuique a Deo.*" Indeed each individual will know as soon as death overtakes him, and before the General Judgment, whether he be saved or lost. "*Cuilibet homini,*" says the Angelic Doctor, "*ante iudicium universale erit certa notitia de sua damnatione vel praemio, non tamen omnibus omnium damnatio vel praeium innotescet. Unde iudicium universale necessarium erit.*"<sup>2</sup> In other words, everyone will know at his death what his state for all eternity will be; and at the General Judgment each will know, in addition, the state of every other man.

Mr. Mivart refers to the fire of hell in terms which would imply that he does not think very seriously of it. "As to the nature of the *poena sensus*, even as undergone by the worst of sinners, Popes and Councils have said very little. What is meant by the expression 'hell fire' has never been defined, and St. Augustine distinctly declares our ignorance about it." It would be difficult, indeed, to give a definition of a thing, the like of which has never entered into the experience of any living man: but far more than enough has been said to inspire the sinner with a wholesome fear. St. Thomas explains that, since "*ignis est maxime afflictivus propter hoc quod abundat in virtute activa, ideo, nomine ignis omnis afflictio designatur, si sit VEHEMENS.*"<sup>3</sup> Again, he lays it down (a. 5): "*Quidquid autem dicatur de igne*

<sup>1</sup> St. Th., 2. 2. q. lxxvii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Supp. 3 q. lxxxviii. a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Supp. 3 q. xevii. a. 1.

put animas separatas cruciat, de igne tamen quo cruciabuntur corpora damnatorum post resurrectionem oportet dicere quod sit corporeus quia corpori non potest convenienter adaptari poena nisi sit corporea."<sup>1</sup> Vide etiam Patrizzi de futuro impiorum statu l. 2; et Passaglia de aeternitate poenae comt. iii.

G. Moroni Romano, in his celebrated *Dizionario di Erudizione*, which holds an honoured place in every ecclesiastical library, says that "the pain of sense consists in suffering the most violent torments without any relief." It is the opinion, he observes, of the "majority of the fathers and of theologians, that hell fire is a true and real fire, though this is not an article of faith; but he declares it to be *of faith* that the damned *always suffer the most cruel tortures in body and in mind, without any consolation and in utter despair.*" En verba.

"La pena del senso consiste nel soffrire i tormenti i più violenti senza il più piccolo refrigerio. La Scrittura c'indica quei tormenti per mezzo del fuoco, e ci dà luogo a credere che il fuoco dell' inferno sarà un fuoco reale e vero, che per una virtù soprannaturale agirà sul corpi e sulle anime senza distruggerle. È questo il sentimento della maggior parte de' padri e dei teologi, ma non è un articolo di fede. Però è di fede che i dannati saranno eternamente separati di Dio, e privati del bene eterno. *È altresì di fede che soffriranno sempre in corpo ed in anima i supplizi i più crudeli senza alcuna consolazione, ed in una totale disperazione.*"

As a climax, we may subjoin the most solemn teaching of the Church, in her councils and synods, wherein she is accustomed to weigh most carefully each word, and

<sup>1</sup> See also Greg., *Epistol.*, c. 29, and S. August., *De Civ. Dei*, vii. c. 10. *Dizionario di Erudizione*, vol. xxxiv., page 291.

N.B.—To the above we may add the summary of Catholic teaching upon this point, as laid down in that justly famous book so highly esteemed in Germany, viz. Weizer und Weste's *Kirchenlexikon* (1889). Under *Hölle*, we read:—"Es steht zweitens fest, dass unter dem Hölle Feuer nicht metaphorisch geistlicher Schmerz und innere Gewissensqual, wie Origenes, Catharinus, Calvin und viele rationalistische Theologen behaupten, sondern ein eigentliches, materielles, von unserem empirischen nicht wesentlich verschiedenes Feuer zu verstehen ist."

And again:—"Die Kirche, abgesehen von ihren Aeusserungen in den liturgischen Gebeten, definiert im Athanasianum ganz einfach: *Habent et ignem aeternum*. Kurz, diese Lehre hat den *eccelesius* sensus ecclesiae et catholicorum (Suarez, l. c. n. 9), für sich, sie ist laut den angesehensten



to select only such expressions as most precisely convey her meaning. In the Lateran Council she declares:—"Omnes resurgent ut recipiant secundum opera sua, sive bona fuerint, sive mala: illi cum diabolo *poenam perpetuam*, et isti cum Christo gloriam sempiternam." And L.I. Innocentii decretum runs as follows:—"Poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis Dei, actualis vero poena peccati est *gehennae perpetuae cruciatus*." So, again, in the Constitution of Benedict XII. beginning, "*Benedictus Deus*," &c., it is defined as follows:—"Difinimus quod secundum Dei ordinationem communem animae decedentium in actuali peccato mortali mox post mortem suam ad inferna descendunt, ubi *poenis infernalibus cruciantur*."

Such expressions as "*poena perpetua*," "*gehennae perpetuae cruciatus*," and "*poenis infernalibus cruciantur*," are too clear to be explained away. The circumstances and occasions which called forth such words forbid us to interpret them as mere rhetorical flourishes, poetical licenses, or artistic "deepening of shadows."

With these facts in view, perhaps Mr. Mivart does not express himself too forcibly when he says (page 916):—"It would ill become us to represent hell as being *in no case* an object of just fear, nay, of prudent, reasonable terror;" and that it cannot "be denied that (according to the teaching of the Church) *some* positive suffering will never cease for those who have *voluntarily and deliberately* cast away from them their supreme beatitude;" or, as St. Paul puts it, who have voluntarily and deliberately "crucified unto themselves the Son of God, making Him a mockery."

Theologen zum mindesten *sententia certa*, die entgegengesetzte aber *eterna, temeraria* (vgl. Baurz. Die Hölle, 109 ff.)."

Again:—"Die Kirche spricht ihren Glauben aus in ihren liturgischen Gebeten, in denen von einer *aeterna damnatio, supplicium aeternum, mors aeterna, perpetua, aeterna nos*, u. s. w. Rede ist."

And:—"Das fünfte allgemeine Concil verwirft im *can. 1* gegen Origenes die Lehre von der Wiederherstellung der Verdammten als monströs: Innocenz III. aber gibt als Strafe der Todsünde die *gehennae perpetuae cruciatus* an (l. 3 decr. tit. 42, c. 3)."

Finally:—"Lessius seinerseits und Petavius (a. a. O) erachten, dass das Feuer unter göttlichem Concurs auch im reinen Geiste und in der *anima separata* eine Empfindung von Glut und Brand erzeuge, ähnlich unserem sinnlichen Schmerzgeföhle."

One of the most astounding, we might almost say shocking, paragraphs in the article referred to, we take to be the following:—"Since the inexpressibly higher condition (*i.e.*, of a Christian), according to the Church, carries with it fearful risks and responsibilities, there is, on Church principles, small reason to regret the late advent and limited diffusion of Christianity, or the falling away from the Church of masses of Christians." (Page 915.)

Considering the whole purpose, so far as man is concerned, of the Incarnation, suffering, passion, and death of the Eternal Son of God, the labours, struggles, hardships, and deaths of thousands of saintly missionaries and apostolic men—worn out in their efforts to spread the Gospel—we cannot understand how any man calling himself a Catholic can calmly proclaim to the world that there is—and on Church principles, too!—"small reason to regret the falling away from the Church of masses of Christians." We infinitely prefer the sentiment of St. Teresa, who declared that she would rejoice to suffer *many* deaths to convert even *one* heretic; or that of St. Paul, who gladly suffered imprisonment, stripes, and dangers of all kinds, and finally death itself, in his endeavours to spread Christianity; and who even exclaimed, "Woe to me, if I preach not the Gospel." If the apostles and missionaries had entertained the views expressed in the above quoted paragraph of Mr. Mivart (but which, for his own sake, we most heartily hope Mr. Mivart does not really cherish), we fear there would now be no Christianity at all left to preserve.

Besides, Christ Himself *commanded* the Catholic faith to be preached everywhere: "Euntes docete omnes gentes." Nay, more, He even offered Himself up, and submitted to a most cruel crucifixion, as theologians teach, for the sake of that Church, whose special duty is to send forth her ministers "into the highways and the bye-ways, and to compel all to enter." "Seipsum tradidit pro ea" *i.e.*, *Ecclesia*—Vide Wreeb. ad Ephes. 5. He furthermore explicitly declares that He desires "all men to come to a knowledge of the truth." If we wish to know the true mind of the Church on this point, we cannot do better than consult the teaching,

and still more the practice, of the great saints of God. We shall then find that nothing could be more opposed to Mr. Mivart's view. They burnt with desire to spread the Catholic faith; they yearned with all their hearts and souls to propagate far and wide the Gospel of Christ, and in many cases were willing, and even anxious, to leave friends, home, and fatherland, and to expose themselves to every species of danger and fatigue, and even martyrdom, to give effect to their desires. May God, in His mercy, grant that we priests, at least, may never live to think that "the falling away from the Church of vast masses of Christians" is anything less than a deplorable misfortune and an inexpressible calamity, to be mourned over with tears of blood.

Mr. Mivart says:—"Man was *mercifully* permitted quickly to fall—the Church speaks of it as *felix culpa*—from that supernatural platform (*i.e.*, from a state of grace) to a merely natural state<sup>1</sup> once more, to be possibly again individually admitted to the higher state through the Incarnation and the Sacrament of Baptism." (Page 904.) Here, Mr. Mivart's meaning seems to be, that Adam's sin was a happy thing, and mercifully permitted, *because it removed the gift of divine grace, which carries with it such awful responsibilities*. We hope we may be wrong in our interpretation of Mr. Mivart's words, but it seems to be the only one borne out by the context. If, however, this really be Mr. Mivart's interpretation, we are very confident that it is not the interpretation of the Church. Original sin was a distinct evil, "*totius naturae malum est, illam inficiens, et corrumpens; estque velut radix et fons actualium peccatorum.*" It is perfectly true that the Church speaks of it, from one point of view, as "a happy fall;" but, not at all because it frees us from any responsibility, but because, in His infinite goodness, God has, on account of it, given us "so great a Redeemer." Mr. Mivart ought, in common fairness, to have given the whole sentence, which runs as follows:—"O *felix culpa quae talem et tantum meruit habere Redemptorem.*" No doubt it is a

<sup>1</sup> N.B.—He does not fall to a "*merely* natural state," at all.

privilege, beyond words, to have God sharing our human nature, and becoming man ; indeed, no one can at all realize the magnitude of the honour thus conferred on the whole race, and all its attendant consequences ; but "si homo non peccasset, probabilius est, Deum non fuisse incarnatum ;"<sup>1</sup> therefore, inasmuch as the "culpa" was the occasion of the Incarnation, it was, indeed, a "*felix*" culpa.

Mr. Mivart commits himself to some strange statements ; e.g., "God has created human beings, the overwhelming majority of whom, being incapable of grave sin, attain to an eternity of unimaginable natural happiness, the utmost of which their nature is capable, and which includes a natural knowledge and love of God." (Page 918.) If he be here alluding to infants who have not arrived at the use of reason, we have yet to learn that they form the "*overwhelming* majority" of those who depart this life. But if he means to include hundreds of millions of adults besides, then we would be very interested to learn where "the most authoritative and dogmatic Christian teaching" declares them to be "incapable of grave sin." In estimating the teaching of the Church, Mr. Mivart tells us he has "sought the most skilled advice." (Page 918.) That, of course, means the most skilled, in his opinion. He is prudent enough, however, not to supply us with the names of his advisers. For they might be found as little to be trusted as Mr. H. Nutcombe Oxenham. "*Omne ignotum pro magnifico.*"

It is a pity that Mr. Mivart does not accept as his guides the great, world-wide, and universally-recognised theologians, instead of anonymous writers in the *Dublin*, and such rather doubtful Catholics as Mr. Oxenham. Even when he does quote representative theologians, he sometimes fails to give to their words their true significance. Thus, in the present instance, he supports his view, that "unbaptized infants enjoy an eternity of natural happiness and union with God beyond anything we can imagine or conceive of" (page 905), by a reference to the following sentence from St. Thomas :—  
"Deo junguntur (i.e. infantes) per participationem naturalium.



bonorum, et ita etiam de Ipso gaudere poterunt naturali cognitione et dilectione"—ergo, he argues, *beati erunt naturaliter*.

Now the conclusion by no means follows from the premisses. We answer in the words of a renowned Jesuit theologian:—

“Nego consequentiam. Ad *beatitudinem enim naturalem* non sufficit quaecumque cognitio et naturalis etiam amor Dei; sed debet cognosci Deus ut amicus, ut unde oriatur amor amicabile, qui amicitiam mutuam supponit. Cum igitur Deus non sit amicus parvulorum culpa originali infectarum, illis similem cognitionem, utpote falsam, non concedet.”

There are several other passages in Mr. Mivart's article, which are open to criticism; but this paper has already exceeded the ordinary limits allowed by the I. E. RECORD. We will end, then, by expressing a hope that the reverend readers of the I. E. RECORD (who, we know, are to be found, not only in Europe, but in America and Australia and other places) will read Mr. Mivart's article for themselves. It is worth reading on many accounts, and will repay careful perusal. Our fear is, that Mr. Mivart's article, as a bishop said the other day, is calculated to “do more harm to Catholics than it will do good to non-catholics.”

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

## ALFRED TENNYSON.

TO determine with certainty what shall be Tennyson's position in English literature a hundred years hence, would be a task of no small difficulty. Judging by the widespread enthusiasm evoked by his death, one would be disposed to conclude that he will occupy a more conspicuous and honoured place than any of his predecessors, Shakespeare and Milton alone excepted. But popular esteem expressed under such circumstances is apt to exaggerate; it has often proved fallible in the past, and most probably will prove so now. Our own opinion is, that, while much of Tennyson's

poetry has already become an integral portion of the English classics, and is, therefore, destined to immortality, there is also much that will be soon forgotten. His dramatic works we should regard as not more enduring than those of Byron: they are unsuitable for representation, and, even at present, are not widely read. Nor are we more sanguine regarding the fate of not a few of his minor poems. Written under the influence of merely passing excitement, they had at best only an ephemeral interest, and are certain before many years to be relegated to the top shelf of unremembered trifles. To this class we should be disposed to assign most of his Laureate verses—all of them, perhaps, except the noble “Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington,” and “The Charge of the Light Brigade.” The works in which Tennyson will be certain to live, are some of his shorter poems, in which feelings common to humanity find expression, and those longer and more elaborate compositions—“The Princess,” “In Memoriam,” “Maud,” and the “Idylls of the King”—in which subjects of abiding interest are dealt with in felicitous and refined language. Side by side with the best passages of Spencer, Dryden, and Pope, will be quoted, as examples of the finest poetry in the language, the verses in which Tennyson reflected the political and religious spirit of his time, the lines in which his own tenderness found expression, and the

“Jewels five words long,  
That on the outstretched forefinger of all time  
Sparkle for ever.”

But whether he shall rank with these illustrious poets on the general merit of his works, it would be premature, as it is unnecessary, at present to decide. Instead of venturing to do so, therefore, we will confine ourselves to such a notice of his life and works as shall indicate the extent to which he has enriched the literature of his country, and advanced the interests of mankind by his advocacy of truth.

When Tennyson first appeared before the public, in his eighteenth year, there was no great popular poet in England. Byron, Shelley, and Keats were no more; their lights had

been extinguished long before reaching the meridian, and the country felt for a time as if enveloped in an eclipse. Coleridge and Wordsworth, no doubt, still lived on; but, though few poets have ever possessed a keener sensibility of beauty, yet the peculiar principles of their school debarred them from the enjoyment of popular favour. Scott was still labouring industriously; but he had long since deserted the domain of poetry, and was already betraying unmistakable signs of premature decay. Campbell and Moore were still active members of the world of letters; but since their poetry rarely pandered to English prejudices, they never succeeded in reaching the heart of the nation. It was at such a time, when the need of a great poet was universally felt, that Tennyson appeared, and for over sixty years he ceased not to pour out, upon every topic of national importance, a wealth of thought and language of which his country might well be proud. On the death of Wordsworth, in 1850, he was created Laureate, receiving the bays

"Greener from the brows  
Of him who uttered nothing base;"

and from that time until his death he was the most striking literary figure in England. The impersonation of loyalty, patriotism, and honour; the representative poet of the Victorian age, as Spencer and Pope were of the ages of Elizabeth and Anne; the acknowledged superior of all his contemporaries, standing head and shoulders above Browning and Morris, and Swinbourne and Rosetti, and the dozen minor votaries of the Muse that are now aspiring to succeed him: he cast a glamour over the minds of his readers which gave to everything that emanated from his pen a peculiar interest. It cannot fail, therefore, to be a work both of pleasure and profit to pass his principal writings before us in review, and to see in what they are worthy of our commendation, in what they deserve the censure of every lover of truth and virtue.

The early associations of our author were not uncongenial to the development of a poetic spirit. An English parsonage, a family that boasted of descent from the Plantagenet line of kings, and a neighbourhood which, though not the most

picturesque, was yet replete with varied interest—these were the first influences that contributed to form his mind. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that, like Pope, he sometimes “biped in numbers, for the numbers came;” and that, in his eighteenth year, while yet a pupil at Louth, in his native county of Lincolnshire, he felt so confident of his powers, that, in conjunction with his brother Charles, he gave his first poetical compositions to the world, in a work entitled, *Poems by Two Brothers*. The unpretentious volume, copies of which are at present fetching fabulous prices in England, bore as its motto the words of Martial: *Hæc nos univimus esse nihil*. The description was not entirely inappropriate; but, like Byron, the young authors felt

“Tis pleasant, saw, to see one’s name in print:  
A book’s a book, although there’s nothing in’t.”

The work was allowed to pass unchallenged by the literary critics of the time, yet some few even then were able to detect in many of its lines “the preludes of a loftier strain.”

The year following the publication of this volume, Charles and Alfred Tennyson entered Cambridge, where their eldest brother Frederick, was already a distinguished student. The transition from the quiet surroundings of Lincolnshire to the active life of a university, had an effect on the poet’s mind somewhat analogous to what takes place when the undeveloped seedling is transplanted from an open flower-bed to the hotter temperature of the conservatory. There was then in Cambridge a brilliant coterie of young men, all of whom became distinguished in after life. Chenevix Trench, Moncreaf Milnes, James Spedding, Henry Alford, John Mitchell Kemble, George Venables, and Arthur Henry Hallam—the last name will recur later on—these became the poet’s companions in his new sphere of life: and the clash of intellect and diversity of speculation that were sure to characterize such a company, could not fail to produce a stimulating and refining influence upon his mind. They

“Held debate, a band  
Of youthful friends, on mind and art,  
And labour and the changing mart,  
And all the framework of the land.”



But while thus engaged, the Tennysons did not cease to woo the Muses. Alfred, especially, conscious of his transcendent gifts, had already decided to devote his life to literature, and was now labouring indefatigably to master the principles of the art of poetry in all its forms. In 1829, he won a gold medal for a poem on the apparently uninviting subject of "Timbuctoo;" and though the work pretended to no higher merits than prize poems usually possess, it elicited the warmest admiration of the critics. The *Athenæum* refers to the author, then a young man of twenty, as having a "first-class poetical genius," and to the poem itself, as one "which would have done honour to any man that ever wrote." Thus encouraged, Tennyson girt his mind for the task he had set himself, with the result that two volumes appeared—one in 1830, entitled, *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical*; the other, in 1832, entitled simply, *Poems*—both furnishing unmistakable proof that a genuine poet had once more arisen, possessing a brilliant imagination, an original fancy, a delicate and refined taste, and marvellous powers of expression.

The judgment of the learned world on the merits of these poems was, with few exceptions, favourable. The most important notice of the work was from the pen of Arthur Henry Hallam, who wrote of it as follows :—

"One of the faithful Islam, a poet in the truest and highest sense, we are anxious to present to our readers. He has yet written little, and published less; but in these 'preludes of a loftier strain' we recognise the inspiring God. Mr. Tennyson belongs decidedly to the class we have described as Poets of Sensation. He sees all the forms of nature with the *eruditus oculus*, and his ear has a fairy fineness. There is a strange earnestness in his worship of beauty, which throws a charm over his impassioned song, more easily felt than described, and not to be escaped by those who have once felt it. . . . We have remarked five distinctive excellences of his manner. First, his luxuriance of imagination, and, at the same time, his control over it. Secondly, his power of embodying himself in ideal characters, or rather moods of character, with such extreme accuracy of adjustment, that the circumstances of the narrative seem to have a natural correspondence with the predominant feeling, and, as it were, to

be evolved from it by assimilative force. Thirdly, his vivid, picturesque delineation of objects, and the peculiar skill with which he binds all of them *justed*, to borrow a metaphor from science, in a medium of strong emotion. Fourthly, the variety of his lyrical measures, the exquisite modulation of harmonious words and cadences to the swell and fall of the feelings expressed. Fifthly, the elevated habits of thought implied in these compositions, and importing a mellow soberness of tone, more impressive to our minds than if the author had drawn up a set of opinions in verse, and sought to instruct the understanding rather than to communicate the love of beauty to the heart."<sup>1</sup>

The most remarkable poems in these volumes are:—  
 "Recollections of the Arabian Knights," "Supposed Confessions of a Sensitive Mind not in Unity with Itself" (afterwards published under a slightly different title); "The Lady of Shalott," "Enone," "A Dream of Fair Women," "The Lotos Eaters," "The Palace of Art," and others. To exemplify their merits, we know few passages more appropriate than the beautiful verses on Jephtha's daughter in the "Dream of Fair Women":—

"As one that museth when broad sunshine laves  
 The lawn of some cathedral, thro' the door,  
 Hearing the holy organ rolling waves  
 Of sound on roof and floor

Within, the anthem sung, is charmed and tied  
 To where he stands—so stood I, when that flow  
 Of music left the lips of her that died  
 To save her father's vow:

The daughter of the warrior Gileadite,  
 A maiden pure; as when she went along  
 From Mizpeh's tower'd gate with welcome light,  
 With timbrel and with song.

She locked her lips: she left me where I stood:  
 'Glory to God,' she sang, and past afar,  
 Thridding the sombre baskage of the wood,  
 Toward the morning star."

Another passage, equally worthy of attention, is the

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Tennyson*, by Henry A. Jerningham, page 27.

description of some of the features of the Palace of Art :—

“ And round the cool green courts there ran a row  
Of cloisters, branch'd like mighty woods,  
Echoing all night to that sonorous flow  
Of spouted fountain floods.

And round the roofs a gilded gallery  
That lent broad verge to distant lands,  
Far as the wild swan wings, to where the sky  
Dipt down to sea and sands.

And high on every peak a statue seem'd  
To hang on tiptoe, tossing up  
A cloud of incense of all odour steam'd  
From out a golden cup.

Likewise the deep-set windows, stain'd and traced,  
Would seem slow-flaming crimson fires,  
From shadow'd grotts of arches interlaced,  
And tipt with front-like spires.”

The best proof that these volumes deserved the eloquent commendations of the critics, and found their way at once to the heart of the reading public, was the immediate demand for a new edition. Tennyson, however, for reasons to be subsequently mentioned, was indisposed just then to gratify the popular wishes, and allowed nine years to elapse ere he again appeared before the public. But the interval was not passed in indolence. When, in 1842, his next work appeared—*Poems*, in two volumes, the second consisting of pieces hitherto unpublished—the progress he had made during the period of silence became manifest, and he sprang at a single bound into the foremost rank of living poets. To mention the names of some of the compositions now given to the world for the first time—“The Talking Oak,” “Godiva,” “Ulysses,” “Dora,” “The Vision of Sin,” “The Day Dream,” “Locksley Hall”—the last considered by many the most impassioned poem in the language—is to recall to the reader's mind poetry which is known and admired wherever the beauties of English literature are appreciated. On their publication, Wordsworth pronounced Tennyson “the greatest of living poets;” Carlyle declared that Tennyson alone, in modern times, “had proved singing

in our curt English tongue to be possible in some measure;" and Edgar Allan Poe asserted that "the uncertainty attending the public conception of the term alone prevents me from demonstrating that Tennyson is the greatest of poets." It may be well, therefore, to pause for a short time in our narrative, for the purpose of reviewing some of the special features of this celebrated work.

These volumes are valuable, in the first place, for the light they shed on the mental development of the poet. As already mentioned, the contents of the first volume had already been published; but now many of the poems appeared considerably modified in form. Some verses, having been deemed faulty, were suppressed; others were introduced for the first time; and many of the most striking passages bore evidence of careful revision. As Tennyson himself facetiously described his habit in this respect, he was wont

"To add and alter many times,  
Till all was rich and rotten.

We are in a position, therefore, to trace stages of improvement in the poet's mind; we are admitted, as it were, into the laboratory of his thoughts, to witness the various processes by which he attained the refinement and delicacy of a finished artist. Using this privilege, then, as far as necessary, we find that, while in the earlier editions of his poetry there was a tendency towards superfluous ornament, towards a wealth of imagery rather than of thought, towards a profusion of the sensuous objects that savoured of the drawing-room rather than of nature in her primitive beauty and freshness, in the later editions much of this has been retrenched. The author has begun to consult for effect more by intensity and depth of feeling—the touch of nature which makes the whole world kin—than by the studied artifices of language, and the tinsel decoration that an inferior artist may easily command. This remarkable change becomes still more evident, if we compare the contents of the second volume with those of the first. If we compare, for instance, "Godiva" or "Locksley Hall" with "The Lady of Shalott" or "Enone," we shall see that their author had now acquired a freer command over all the



resources of his art—a firmer grasp of his subject, more definite views of life and of its great problems, a sincerer love of truth and honour and beauty, a keener insight into the workings of man's spiritual being. Already he had attained the state of mind which he himself describes for us in the oft-quoted lines of "Locksley Hall":—

"For I dipt into the future far as human eye could see;  
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;  
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,  
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;  
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a  
ghastly dew  
From the nations' airy navies, grappling in the central blue;  
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing  
warm  
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-  
storm;  
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags  
were fur'd  
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

There was one other feature of these poems which was most gratifying to minds that had been accustomed to the scoffing impiety of Shelley, and the morbid licentiousness of Byron and of the poets of his school. We refer to the purity of moral tone and elevation of sentiment that inspired the thought and language of every line. In this respect Tennyson realized in a higher degree than any of his predecessors his own description of the true poet,

"Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn, the  
love of love;"

and of the true poet's mind:—

"Clear and bright it should be ever,  
Flowing like a crystal river;  
Bright as light, and clear as wind."

In their notices of the poems we have been just considering, many critics drew special attention to the manner in which they reflected the spirit of their time. "Here was a poet who, while he could paint charming little vignettes, could also give expression to the struggles of emotion, the heart-throbs of unrest, that make up so much of the strange drama

of our modern life."<sup>1</sup> Nor had he long to wait for a subject which was at once more commensurate with the lofty character of his genius, and better calculated to bring into play this important quality of his mind than any he had touched on hitherto. The success of the Reform movement in 1832 had inspired many political theorists with large schemes of enfranchisement. Among other subjects mooted was the vexed question of "Woman's Rights." Though not fully ventilated until 1851, when an article in the *Westminster Review* brought it prominently before the public, yet it did not lack enthusiastic champions long before that date. The very nature of democracy, it was argued, is a protest against privilege and despotism, and holds as a fundamental principle that all are born with equal rights. Distinctions founded on class and colour had, in virtue of this principle, been completely swept away; and why, it was asked, retain the anomalous privilege founded on distinction of sex? Why not throw open the universities, the professions, and the legislature, to women as well as to men? It was to confute the extravagant pretensions involved in such arguments that Tennyson wrote "The Princess;" and the kindly banter and good-humoured irony with which he evolved the plot of the story, did more to teach woman her proper sphere in society than all the political philosophy of Stewart or Mill. The collapse of the proud university, notwithstanding its wealth of literature and science and art, and the transformation of its "sacred halls" into a temporary hospital where "Love held carnival at will," where the "prudes" and "dowagers" became love-sick nurses, and the "sweet girl graduates in their golden hair" no longer flaunted their academic honours, convinced the most ardent champions of "Woman's Rights" of the true relations between the sexes.

Independently, however, of the higher purpose of the poem, there were other features of interest in it that won for it an immediate popularity. The author gave it the alternative title of "A Morte-d'Arthur," by which he intended to shadow forth the restless spirit of the time. Art, science, university life, courtly romance, a tournament of the middle ages, an

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Tennyson*, by Henry J. Jennings, page 63.

improvised institution for the exercise of charity—all are introduced to portray the constantly varying complexion of modern society. Subordinate to this end, yet contributing towards it, there occur throughout the work passages of great beauty and power, and touches of original genius, that could emanate only from a great poet. Taking all these qualities in conjunction with the faultless versification, the picturesque description, the innumerable “jewels five words long,” embodying piquant prettinesses and sentimental nothings, rarely if ever so well expressed before, we have no hesitation in pronouncing “*The Princess*” the most interesting, though not the greatest, of Tennyson’s works.

Arthur Henry Hallam, whose critique of Tennyson’s early poems we cited above, was son of the distinguished historian. The poet and he had been students together at Cambridge, and a similarity of tastes had led to the formation of a friendship unique in the history of literature. At the close of a university career of the most brilliant promise, Hallam accompanied his father to the continent, and died suddenly at Vienna, when only in his twenty-third year. The sad event produced on the poet’s mind a gloomy melancholy, accompanied by a sense of irreparable loss. For seventeen years he continued to brood over his bereavement, and the varying moods of sorrow through which his soul passed in the interval were to find expression in the most remarkable poem of the nineteenth century. “*In Memoriam*”<sup>1</sup> was given to the world in 1850. To a casual reader it seems nothing more than a series of short poems—one hundred and thirty-one in number—having no closer connection, one with another, than is maintained by a uniform metre, and the constant reference of all its parts to one all-embracing sorrow. But this is a totally inadequate representation of the work. To those who have penetrated its hidden meaning, it has become a treasury of knowledge, a mine of sentiment, a fountain from which the ablest

<sup>1</sup> Several Commentaries and Keys have been written to explain the arrangement and hidden significance of this remarkable work. We ourselves are under obligations to Professor Genung’s admirable essay on the subject.

thinkers of modern times have drawn the expression of ideas not easily crystallized in words. A work of such importance is not to be lightly passed over. We, therefore, feel justified in devoting to it a more detailed consideration than any other composition of Tennyson seems to demand at our hands.

"In Memoriam" may be viewed under three different aspects, and from whatever point we regard it, we shall have little difficulty in pronouncing it the ablest work of its kind. It is at once an elegy, a tribute of friendship, and a reflex of the spirit of its time. Starting, with that sense of vacancy and bewilderment which the soul experiences in the presence of death, when the future is blank and the past alone remembered, when spiritual sensibilities are partially blunted, and fidelity to the memory of the departed seems alone of obligation, the poem proceeds, as most similar works do, to dilate on the misery of blighted fame, the sweetness of past companionship, the intrinsic nature of love. Unlike other elegies, however, with which it has been compared—Milton's *Lycidas* and Shelley's *Adonais*, for example—"In Memoriam" does not stop here, but goes on to speculate on the most important problems of our complex being—on life and death, on reason and faith, on the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. Instead of viewing death as a basis on which to rear a superstructure of merely rational hypotheses, as do Milton and Shelley, Tennyson makes it the starting-point from which to explore "the unknown country from whose bourne no traveller returns." This he does, however, not after the fashion of metaphysicians or theologians, but in a manner purely lyrical, in which the affections alone become his guide; and following their lead he confidently reaches the conclusion for which his heart had bade him hope:—

" They do not die  
Nor lose their mortal sympathy,  
Nor change to us, although they change."

As a tribute of friendship, "In Memoriam" has often been compared to the "Sonnets" of Shakespeare.



Indeed, the author himself suggests the comparison, in the lines :—

“ I loved thee, spirit, and love, nor can  
The soul of Shakespeare love thee more.”

But the similarity is only superficial, while the points of difference, all of which are decidedly in Tennyson's favour, are both numerous and important. Bereavement in Shakespeare is caused by absence ; in Tennyson, by death. The longings of Shakespeare are “ of the earth, earthy ; ” those of Tennyson are purified and idealized by death, and seek their ultimate fruition in the eternal companionship of heaven. The affection of Shakespeare is confined to the narrow limits of one man for another ; that of Tennyson identifies the soul of his friend with all the forms and operations of nature, and thus embraces all creation within the circle of its influence :—

“ Strange friend, past, present, and to be,  
Loved deeper, darklier understood,  
Behold I dream a dream of God,  
And mingle all the world with thee.”

Under no aspect, however, does “ In Memoriam ” prove so interesting as when viewed as a reflex of its time. The seventeen years spent in its composition embrace the most vital movements of the century. The progress made in science by the use of steam and electricity ; the general adoption of democratic principles in the government of peoples ; the momentous religious upheaval which had its origin in Oxford, and found learned and eloquent expression in the *Tracts for the Times* : these and other scarcely less important events were included in those years. A poet whose soul thrilled like an Æolian harp in response to every movement of his time, could not wholly free himself from their influence. We may expect, therefore, to find the general character of the period reproduced, with more or less fidelity, in the pages of “ In Memoriam.”

The form in which the spirit of the age finds expression is manifold. At one time the threnodist expresses his determination to be faithful to his vocation of poet, though the

world of science may sneer at the spirit of his verse. Though men should ask :—

“ Is this an hour  
For private sorrow's barren song,  
When more and more the people throng  
The chairs and thrones of civil power?—

A time to sicken and to swoon,  
When science reaches forth her arms  
To feel from world to world, and charms  
Her secret from the latest moon? ”—

he will, nevertheless, continue to sing, if only with a view to interpret the “unseen things from the world of the seen.” The great problems of the existence of God, the nature and immortality of the soul, the ultimate fate of the reprobate, and innumerable others—all infinitely more important than political speculations or scientific discoveries—press for instant solution; and, by the light of love, and under the chastening discipline of bereavement, he determines to solve them one by one. Unfortunately, for the poet, he rejected the logical method for the lyrical, making imagination the hand-maid of thought, constituting the feelings the guides and not the followers of reason. “They are dangerous guides, the feelings;” and the religious training of the Church of England is not the surest guarantee of success in metaphysical speculations. We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find this novel method of dealing with spiritual subjects betraying its author into egotistic errors, which are all the more dangerous and seductive because of the beautiful poetic form in which they are expressed.<sup>1</sup>

A profound believer in “honest doubt,” the poet declined to accept the teaching of the inspired text, that “the heavens shew forth the glory of God,” that “the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that He made;” and adopts instead, as the *only* valid proof of the existence of God, a

<sup>1</sup> Owing to the happy timing of copies of “In Memoriam,” see an allusion to “Tennyson's Philosophy,” in the third volume of the *L. E. Review* (May, 1882), by the Very Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., President of the Dunboyne Establishment, Maynooth College.

mysterious "warmth within the breast," which impels "the heart" to answer, "I have felt":—

'I found Him not in world or sun,  
Or eagle's wing or insect's eye;  
Nor thro' the questions men may try,  
The petty cobwebs we have spun :  
If e'er when faith had fallen asleep,  
I heard a voice 'believe no more,'  
And heard an ever-breaking shore  
That tumbled on the godless deep ;  
A warmth within the breast would melt  
The freezing reason's colder part,  
And, like a man in wrath, the heart  
Stood up and answer'd, I have felt."

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul also he refuses to accept from purely logical premises, and establishes it by the lyrical methods already explained :—

"Thou wilt not leave us in the dust :  
Thou madest man, he knows not why ;  
He thinks he was not made to die,  
And Thou hast made him : Thou art just."

For if it were otherwise, "'twere best at once to sink to peace," "earth were darkness to the core," and man himself

"A monster, then, a dream,  
A discord. Dragons of the prime,  
That tear each other in their slime,  
Were mellow music matched with him."

But, while arriving at a correct conclusion on the question of the soul's immortality, the poet concocts a strange farrago of Astrology, Pantheism, and Metempsychosis, when dealing with its origin and condition of being. The union of soul and body takes place when

"Star and system, rolling past,  
A soul shall draw from out the vast,  
And strike its being into bounds."

Of the relation that subsists between soul and body, he writes :—

"Eternal process moving on,  
From state to state the spirit walks,  
And these are but the shatter'd stalks  
And ruined chrysalis of one."

And after death the soul—if the language of the poet be not wholly figurative—becomes so identified with nature that it affects us through the varied activities of the world of sense:—

“Thy voice is on the rolling air;  
 I hear thee where the waters run.  
 Thou standest in the rising sun,  
 And in his setting thou art fair.  
 What art thou, then? I cannot guess;  
 But, tho’ I seem in star and flower  
 To feel thee some diffusive power,  
 I do not, therefore, love thee less.  
 My love involves the love before;  
 My love is *truster* passion now:  
 Tho’ mixed with God and Nature thou,  
 I seem to love thee more and more.”

The fundamental dogma of eternal punishment involves considerations that render it repulsive to the refined sensibilities of the poet, and so it cannot be made to harmonize with his lyrical method of proof. After various ineffectual attempts to arrive at a definite conclusion, he lapses gradually into scepticism, and concludes by adopting the Restorationism of Farrar, the novel doctrine of “the larger hope”:—

“Oh, yet we trust that somehow good  
 Will be the final goal of ill,  
 To pangs of nature, sins of will,  
 Defects of doubt, and taints of blood.  
 That nothing walks with aimless feet:  
 That not one life shall be destroyed,  
 Or cast as rubbish to the void  
 When God hath made the pile complete.  
 . . . . .  
 I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,  
 And gather dust and chaff, and call  
 To what I feel is Lord of all,  
 And faintly trust ‘the larger hope.’”

From these extracts it becomes manifest that, however beautiful “In Memoriam” is, from an artistic point of view, as a metaphysical and theological poem, it is *verge* that useless. So far from furnishing additional support to the



great dogmas of Christianity, it ignores some of them altogether, and runs counter to others. As a reflex of the religious condition of England, between 1833 and 1850, it reveals the Babel of unbelief that has been reared on the principles of the so-called Reformation, the confusion of theories and principles to which English Protestantism has given birth.

Apart, however, from the doctrinal aspect of "*In Memoriam*," there are artistic features of the work which shall ever entitle it to a foremost place in the literature of England. If "unity amidst variety" be the essence of beauty, then few poems in the language so deserve to be accounted beautiful. To the casual reader, the one hundred and thirty-one poems of which it consists, seem to have little or no connection one with another. But this is not the case. On closer examination, an undercurrent of feeling is discoverable throughout, which binds the various parts into a perfectly organized whole. The "chorus-poems," in which the singer's mood is described, and the "Christmas Poems," in which the recurring Christmas Eves are distinctly referred to, furnish a key by which the arrangement becomes manifest. In addition to a prologue and an epilogue, we thus discover three distinct cycles, each characterized by a peculiar spirit, and each contributing in its degree to form a work at once beautiful in all its parts, and symmetrical as a whole. If to this be added the sweetness and simplicity of the language, the faultless flow of the metre, the dirge-like cadence of the verse—here introduced by Tennyson for the first time in elegiac poetry—we shall not be at a loss to understand why "*In Memoriam*," as Mr. Froude states, "has become to many [Protestants] in England what the 'Christian Year' was to orthodox churchmen. We read them, and they become part of our minds, the expression, in exquisite language, of the feelings that were working in ourselves."

JOHN CLANCY.

(*To be continued.*)

## THE IRISH ABROAD.

## THE CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA.

THE telegraph wires, the telephone, the fast-scuttling steamer, and the rolling railway-engine, have almost reduced an apparent hyperbole to a literal fact. Space is practically annihilated. Though more than thirteen thousand miles of a trackless watery waste lie between us, every third day the prow of some inward-bound steamer from the old land, bearing volumes of news and its freight of immigrant passengers, touches our shores. Through the agency of the submarine cable, a summary of events passing in your half of the globe is laid on our breakfast table regularly every morning, and shouted by a hundred newsboys on our streets before sunset. Australia has ceased to be the far-off *terra incognita*.

With all these facilities for communication, I fear your knowledge of the Ireland and the Irish Church of these lands is not as extensive or as accurate as it might be. In late years, 'tis true, the translations of Cardinal Moran and Archbishop Carr, and the appearance of eloquent political delegates from Ireland, have called more attention to the antipodes, and brought us more in touch with each other; though Irish journalists have made small effort to spread a knowledge of, and awaken an interest in, the life and doings of their countrymen under the Southern Cross. Scarcely a year passes that we are not visited by a special envoy from a leading English newspaper to fulfil the double mission of lecturing while here, and writing special articles on everything Australian. Salt, and Forbes, and Christie Murray have been with us in late years, and have written some hundreds of columns about us. "Our own correspondents" here are connected with every notable English paper, and keep them *au courant* with our life and doings. English magazines are flooded with articles on Australian life, finance, prospects, &c.; till, to the English public, the doings of Sydney or Melbourne must be as well known and as much objects of

interest as the events passing in Liverpool or Manchester. How stands it with Ireland? Over a million of our countrymen have found homes beneath these skies, and what interest has the old parent evinced in her young and prosperous offshoot?

I fear the old idea of Australia as a *colony*, dependent on the apron-strings of England, governed by a handful of British officials, with cities composed of bark houses for the white, and mud huts for the nigger, with a country wild and trackless, full of danger and strange adventure, snakes, blacks, and bushrangers--this archaic idea still lingers, I fear, in the minds of many. Such people may be surprised to hear that we have more than one capital surpassing Dublin in population, while in wealth and progressive energy they leave Dublin far behind.

Scattered through the country, cities as large as Kilkenny or Waterford are by no means scarce. The convict and the bushranger have now almost become as much subjects of ancient history as the Irish wolf-dog or rapperee. Snakes do not lurk in every grass-tuft, for the writer, though having lived twelve years in the country, never saw half-a-dozen outside the glass-cases of a museum. The old *colony* has completely passed away, and the young *nation* is already standing on its legs, rapidly, but definitely, shaping itself. Purely Australian characteristics, distinct and original, are developing, in bolder and more clear-cut outlines every year, characteristics stamped with an originality as unique and as striking as that which distinguishes the *fauna* and *flora* of our forests.

With your permission, having devoted an article to our emigrant countrymen, in general, calculated to assist those whose duty it is to direct and prepare them for new and strange worlds beyond the seas, I will give what help I can to intending missionaries by sketching a picture of the life before them, and giving some hints that may assist to prepare for its contingencies and wants.

The crowds of our countrymen thronging the decks of incoming steamers may be divided into three classes:—(1), the professional; (2), the skilled artisan; (3), the non-

descript, comprising farm labourers, "rakes," schoolboys, &c. I shall deal with each separately.

1. Australia, though not quite a paradise, offers an ample field for the exercise of professional skill and energy, combined with patience and some capital. A professional man, in any branch, no matter what his home reputation may be, must be prepared to stand siege from local established practice; still, there is room for him, and big remuneration if he succeeds. A lawyer, no matter what his abilities or testimonials are, must reside six months in New South Wales before being admitted; while in Victoria, the amalgamation of the two branches—attorney and barrister—practically excludes foreigners. With all these disabilities, there is scarcely any profession more lucrative. The number of land transfers and contracts, the readiness with which people turn to the solicitor's office or the court-house for every trifle, makes the calling a paying one. Of the native youth, seeking professional rank, fully eighty per cent. turn their faces towards a lawyer's desk.

Though we have two splendid schools of medicine, with long and trying courses, lavishly equipped, and adorned by some of the ablest about the English universities could produce, the number of native diplomas is as yet insignificant, compared with those hailing from the British Isles. The immigrant doctor, who attempts to establish a city practice, no matter how high he stands on your side of the equator, must have his purse well lined with gold. There is scarcely an ear left to glean: the practice is overlone; indeed city congestion, in every shape, is one of the most deplorable of our national evils. In good country towns, a doctor may make from five hundred to two thousand pounds, not so much by the number of his patients as by the "mileage." This income may appear large in countries where money is dear and labour cheap; here, however, five hundred pounds to a married professional man means bare existence, and nothing more.

Strange as it may seem, though we be the most horsey people in the world, veterinaries would starve. Horses are cheap, and few of them of sufficient value to tempt a surgeon



twenty or thirty miles to attend them ; then, the people in general have large experience and knowledge of horse-flesh and its ordinary attendant diseases ; so they are their own vets. When you can add to this, that there is in every district a Government official known as a “ Stock Inspector,” skilled in cattle and horse diseases, you will scarcely wonder that the term “ Farrier ” is not known amongst us.

2. In the ranks of the second class—skilled artisans—few of our countrymen are to be found. This is one of the greatest drawbacks to our people. If this weak spot were once remedied at home, the status and power of the Irish race abroad would soon be changed. A man, landing on Sydney-quay, with a good trade and sober habits, cannot help rising to fortune and affluence. The highest prizes in the land are not beyond his ambition. A few facts will show that this is far from mere rhetoric. No tradesman can or will work for less than ten shillings a-day. This is the minimum ; the ordinary wage is twelve shillings. I say “ can,” because in no country are “ Trades Unions ” so supreme and universal. Tradesmen in the higher branches get wages almost beyond belief. A good tailor-cutter earns from five to seven pounds a-week. In all trades, eight hours is the legalized time ; so that while the sun is still high in the heavens, and four full hours of daylight before him, the stroke of five o'clock declares his day ended. This is a long way removed from white slavery. Socially, a tradesman is highly respected, and invariably addressed as “ Mr. ” He takes his place in the Committee Room, the Town Council, and even in the Legislature, beside the merchant and the lawyer. Men of wealth and position are not ashamed to send their sons into the workshop, often in preference to a profession. The Member of Parliament, indeed the Cabinet Minister, is not ashamed to take his coat off, and handle the trowel or lathe, side by side with his own men.

I can fancy people of aristocratic notions asking—“ are these the men who compose your Parliaments ? ” 'Tis true that many of our members, instead of hiding, boast of horny hands ; and we imagine that the men who had the courage to brave the dangers of a new land, the ability and foresight to be

the architects of their own fortunes, are the proper men to shape the destinies and frame the laws of the country they have helped to make. The success of a man in his private business is the surest passport to the confidence of the people, and a good test of his capacity to manage their affairs. Our whole social system is based on democratic lines. Men do not ask here who you are, but what you can do. If the blood of all the Howards and Coues continued flowed in your veins, it would not *per se* avail to get the position of a shoe-black. A man will not be judged by the length of pedigrees or the dauntless deeds of noble ancestry, but by the standard of personal worth and character, and by it alone.

To return. The importance of the artisan cannot decrease; on the contrary, when intercolonial federation is an accomplished fact, and the various States are trading between themselves, but closed against the world outside, his importance is certain to rise with our protected factories and crafts. Be that as it may, many generations must pass before the status of those trades that minister to our daily life, such as the smith, the tailor, the baker, &c., can diminish. With a continual influx area approaches that of Europe, and a population less than that of the single city of London, with floods of immigrants flowing in on every tide, it is evident the importance of the trowel, the saw, and the needle, cannot diminish. In a land where houses and towns are springing up on all sides; where the card so familiar in the cheerless windows of the old land, bearing the suggestive words "To Let," is nowhere to be seen; where the ring of the hushtman's axe is heard to-day in regions that to-morrow may echo the railway whistle, the stability of these trades is self-evident.

3. Of the third class of immigrants—heterogeneous, wanting a profession or trade—the most unlikely to prosper is the well-reared young man, unaccustomed to the habits of industry, and under the impression that he is educated. His education is generally of very little use here. As a rule, it is desultory and impractical. He may know a book or two of Euclid; an indifferent translation of Latin scraps is possibly, not beyond his reach; but of book-keeping, type-

writing, shorthand, &c., he knows nothing. Were he skilled even in those and similar branches, the chances of employment are few. The native youth are always on the alert for light labour and clerkships. They are on the spot, ready, sharp, and up to the requirements of their country, so the odds against the foreigner are heavy.

The foolish pride that kept him from inuring himself to hard labour at home, or learning a useful trade, stands against him here. Of industrious habits, of skilled labour, or those sections of education convertible into solid cash, he knows nothing; but of foolish family pride, spendthrift and often intemperate ways, he has more than abundant. Such gradually sink to the lowest strata of our population. Some few are fortunate enough to get into the police, some hawk books or samples on broken uppers, while many carry the "swag" or blanket, and tramp the country. In the old gold-mining days accident often threw fortunes into their hands; but those days have passed away. A respectable, nicely-educated son of a well-to-do farmer landing here, and starting the race of life by the side of his own servant boy, who, perhaps, often knew the want of, but certainly learned how to earn and husband, a shilling, will find the chances are a hundred to one that the former servant is destined to be the future master. The social principles and ideas of two nations are oftentimes as marked and contradictory as their respective lines of latitude.

Unfortunately, in Ireland, an idea prevails that should a boy's father happen to possess a few hundred acres, or rejoice in fairly affluent circumstances, it would be an anachronism and degrading for him to learn the science of farming at the plough-tail. It is no exaggeration to say there are hundreds of fine young men here, weeping victims of such a mistaken notion. The young Australian will never fall its prey. The idea that wealth gives a title to idleness, is not known here. The squatter and his sons, who number their flocks and herds by thousands, who perhaps once graduated at "Baliol," or "Magdalen," consider it the right and proper thing to

"Meet the sun upon the upland lawn,"

in cabbage-tree hat and flannels, with their stock-riders and herdsmen. They swelter at shearing and branding time under the iron roofs of their sheds, or in the stock yards, through the livelong summer broils. I once spoke to a man who inherited half-a-million, and asked him why did he drudge at a profession, considering his splendid wealth. He said he would feel degraded to be condemned to lead the life of a loafer on the money for which his honest father toiled: he felt it an imperative duty to leave an example of industry to his children; and as a patriotic Australian he considered it a national crime in a land where labour is dignified, and no man exempt from it, to live a drone. This answer clearly and definitely epitomized the whole spirit of this country on the subject; nor could I withhold admiration.

There is one class upon whom Irish friends commit a cruel, heartless crime when they send them here. I refer to the good-for-nothing and spendthrift sons; a crime not only against the land on which they inflict their family outcasts, but ten times deeper on the unfortunate wretch himself. They felicitate themselves when they see the last speck of canvas dip below the horizon, bearing their social curse away. They hug the idea that they have done what is just and right—in fact, achieved quite a *coup*: they have banished the *bête noir*, and lifted a stain and reproach from the family. But do they ever consider the destiny they have forced on the unfortunate? They have thrown him adrift among strangers, generally at an age when the period for forming habits of industry, or awakening ambition, has long since passed; with all the engendered habits of idleness, intemperance, prodigality ripe and full upon his head, without self-control, without the knowledge of bread-winning, without habits of industry, without friends or funds, helpless and abandoned. Will the relations of such be surprised to learn that if they should desire the Australian address of their long-lost brother, in nine cases out of ten “Her Majesty’s Prison” will find him. To be sure, “he left his country for his country’s good;” but if his friends could not give him a crust of charity at home, where there might be some hope of reclamation,



his land, at least, could easily afford him a gaol, and not throw him on the taxes of a people who often helped and succoured, but never harmed, Ireland.

There is another class which no priest should hesitate in recommending to try their fortune here—female emigrants. The servant-girl is a queen in Australia. Her wages are excellent: the most untidy and worthless can have a home and ten shillings a-week, and need never be a day without a situation. Good cooks and laundresses get from fifteen to twenty shillings a-week. The numerical proportion between the sexes has never been adjusted since the gold-mining days. Men only immigrated then, and the balance has never since been perfectly restored. In this colony the male population is far in excess of the female.

From this the necessary demand for female labour is evident. The status of servants, too, carries not the slightest taint of degradation. No girl is thought little of, because she honestly earns her bread. Nor does she think little of herself. Many would become indignant if it were heard they took less than “dress circle” tickets at a theatre, or travelled in a second-class railway carriage. A girl never says, “I was at service,” but “I lived with Mrs. So-and-So.” The Australian lady, too, will never degrade her “help.” Her own feelings and her surroundings forbid it. She is the child of a land where the full dignity of labour is recognised, and herself a fair embodiment of its republican spirit, free, frank, with an air of self-conscious dignity, able to form an opinion, and not afraid to express and defend it. While there is little of the “Woman’s Right” party about her, there is certainly none of the “shilly shally” imbecile, afraid of her own existence, and constantly requiring a support to lean on. She herself is eminently proud of earning her own bread. I have known the daughters of men with thousands to their bank account become school-mistresses and governesses, often in houses maintaining comforts far inferior to those of their fathers’ homes. The proud independence of owning and spending the fruit of one’s toil is highly attractive to the Australian spirit.

Frequent travel, constant intercourse with strangers, the

long journeys and privations which often overtake the best in the bush, have combined to give her force and strength of character, self-reliance, and striking individuality. There is no lady here who would not blush to confess a practical ignorance of the meanest details of house-work. A knowledge of cooking, housekeeping, and dressmaking, are not only looked on as essential, but form a permanent part in the curriculum of higher convent schools and ladies' colleges. Such mistresses are not calculated to make slaves.

Though the position of the Irish element is far from low—on the contrary, perhaps higher than in any other land to which our exiled countrymen have turned their faces, the question still may be asked, Under circumstances so favourable, why is it not higher? Why is the great bulk to be found among the hewers of wood? A few illustrious names have, indeed, risen to prominence, and have either by their daring courage or conspicuous talents engraven themselves among the chosen few whom posterity must revere as the pioneers of a great nation. Many are in the first ranks of our wealthy traders and merchants; yet there is no denying the fact, the masses of our people are below the level they should occupy, and this with a climate unrivalled in the world's wide expanse, having every degree of temperature to be found between Nova Zembla and Lahore; in a country too rich in soil and mineral, and as ample as heart can desire; with laws in the main most liberal, affording every encouragement to industry, made solely not for the drones, but workers. Some unjust enactments—heritage of old time bigotry—'tis true, still stain our statute book, but the hostile spirit that gave them birth is fast melting before growing enlightenment and a fuller knowledge of our claims. Here, too, there are no class distinctions nor monopolies to repress ambition; the brightest social or political level is open to the humblest, who will never drag a degrading chain in his upward march, because he chanced to be born with a wooden spoon; every man is as free as the wild breezes rolling around him.

Under such circumstances what miracles should not the Irish Celt have effected with his strong arm, clear reasoning head, and a heart resolute and brave for the dangers and

ventures of a new land, whose treasures in golden abundance await his efforts. That we have not achieved all we might, I attribute to three heads.

First, their *gregarious habits* inclining them to hanker after a city, even for a bare subsistence, instead of boldly striking into the country, and from the first making an effort to acquire ownership and fix upon the soil. Every colony is suffering from town congestion. It seems as if this land is stricken with a social disease similar to that known in the human system as hydrocephalus—the head large beyond all proportion for the body, and eating up its substance. Need I say the whole social system feels the effects, and is enervated by it. It seems scarcely credible, that in a land where the interior offers such inducements, almost one-third of the entire population is to be found within the city of Sydney. The Irishman, of all others, has the least excuse. His peasant habits, his want of a trade, should teach him where his opportunity is. Having acquired some capital and experience in colonial farming, he can easily become a yeoman of the soil. Every person in New South Wales can select six hundred and forty acres, and purchase a fee-simple for ever for twenty shillings, two-and-sixpence of which alone is required to be paid at occupation. He gets his own time to pay off the remaining seventeen-and-sixpence. He, doubtless, will have to clear the timber off, but he will never want artificial manure. A virgin soil, rich and grain-producing, awaits his plough. His wife and every child in his house of either sex, having attained the age of fifteen, can also take up six hundred and forty acres. Five years having elapsed, he and they become free to select again. Thus after ten or fifteen years of clearing and adding to his cultivated areas, he finds himself master of a splendid estate. Every year agriculture is receiving more attention and attaining greater prominence. The most scientific methods and newest implements are to be found even in the “back blocks!” Shows and exhibits of produce are annually held in almost every village, and the Governments are only too anxious to extend every encampment. Who will excuse our countrymen for hanging

round the lamp-posts of a city, while such opportunities for wealth and homesteads are to be found beyond its walls? especially, when I add that, unlike Ireland or America, there is no dead-lock of snowed-up winter months to face. A man can work all the year through without being forced to eat his industry in idleness during any period. The best parting injunction an Irish priest could give his emigrating flock would be—*Fly from the towns, and be not disheartened at the difficulties of your early settlement.*

Second, one of the greatest drawbacks to Irish emigrants is their almost absolute ignorance of trade or mechanical arts. I have already pointed out the high position of the artisan here, and I now repeat that the Irish abroad would stand on a far loftier level, if, at home, some efforts were made to break down the stupid prejudice that prevents farmers, with more sons than farms, from apprenticing their youths to practical trades. If there is one sight to a priest of experience, more sad, it is to see on the deck of an incoming steamer, his own stalwarth countrymen, with brawny limbs and quick intelligence, by the side of the sickly-looking tradesman from Lancashire, and to know that the man, whom God and nature have stamped as the born master, is destined to be the servant. Five years will probably find the artisan sitting at the Council Board of a bush city, regulating the wages of his strapping fellow-passenger, who is consuming his splendid vigour in making roads and culverts. Poor fellow! he should, indeed, be the superior, and not the slave, but for the primal curse of his country's suicidal pride. If, in other days, perhaps, a friend suggested the advisability of a trade, his family would consider the escutcheon of the house tarnished by the mere mention of it. Time has now convinced him, and left him to regret the folly of notions that have placed a mill-stone on his neck, and tied his hand in the struggle of a life, where the needle and chisel might prove Archimedean levers to move fortune and affluence to his doors. Almost two centuries have passed since Addison, in language as trenchant as it was polished, gibbeted this absurdity. Speaking of a typical country squire, he says:—"Will Wimble's is the case



of many a younger brother of a great family, who had rather see their children starve like gentlemen than thrive in a trade or profession that is beneath their quality. This humour fills several parts of Europe with pride and beggary."

His countrymen have mended much since the Spectator walked amongst them; but substitute Ireland for Europe, and how applicable are these words to-day. The strongest, the most convincing reasons stand absolutely powerless before the biting, caustic cynicism that gathers with such bitterness and scorn on the delicate curves of Irish lips, when they sneer the contemptuous epithets of "little tailor," or carpenter. With a race, proud almost to romance, and not only masters of, but exquisitely sensitive to, ridicule, to suggest the idea of a barber as a good trade, would only provoke laughter and derision. Will you be surprised to learn, that even a second-rate barber here draws as high a wage as a lieutenant holding Her Majesty's Commission, and that his profession will never debar him from any social or political distinction he may feel entitled to aspire to? that tinsmiths and plumbers drive their families out in their own traps and fast trotters, and put roast beef on their tables? While alas! for the large bulk of our countrymen, the pick and shovel alone remain. So long as Ireland at home is the deluded victim of unreasoning prejudice and want of forethought, Ireland abroad must drag the chain.

Third, *drink*, like the trail of the serpent, follows our race the world over. The records of the police courts and statistics of the gaol, bear sad but damning evidence against us, evidence used with telling effect in every stand-up fight with the enemies of our Church and land, and often causes the shame-spot to burn on Irish cheeks. In Australian eyes intemperance is a moral stain, dark and deep. English evangelists and non-conformists make temperance their sole virtue. Their propaganda is growing and active, no town or village without its Good Templar or Rechabite lodge. They are steadily forming public opinion and training it to look upon the drunkard with horror. Their efforts are powerfully seconded by the inborn ideas and habits of the native race, who, as a rule, are essentially sober and

satisfied with the wines of the country. What wonder, then, that public opinion is strongly against drink, and places the intemperate man very low, indeed, in the social scale.

Why the Irish element does not rank as high as it should, can be easily understood now. The great wonder is, that they have attained their present very respectable level; for, all things considered, they have made wonderful upward bounds. Few people landing on these shores start on the race of life with heavier handicaps—(a) wanting education of a practical kind; (b) without capital—English and Scottish men and families come here often with large fortunes; (c) ignorance of trades or arts; (d) the absence of that keen, sharp, business habit, or systematic methods, so quickly acquired by friction with peoples of divers races, with their new and strange sympathies and ideas. Notwithstanding all this, the Irish in Australia can in every way favourably compare with any portion of the race the world over.

Though the subjects of my future papers will be purely ecclesiastical, this one will be found to be by no means out of joint with what is to follow.

MICHAEL PHELAN.

---

### DID MOSES WRITE THE PENTATEUCH?—III.

#### DIFFICULTIES ANSWERED.

HAVING already proved the traditional view, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, we come now to consider the arguments of those who, rejecting that view, hold that the work did not assume its present form until centuries after the time of the Hebrew legislator. It will be useful before proceeding to discuss particular difficulties, to define exactly the general position of ourselves and our adversaries, that the reader may clearly understand what it is precisely for which we and they are contending. Our position then is, that Moses wrote the books *substantially* as we have them.

Relying on the tradition of more than three thousand years, and on the evidence which, as we have seen, the books themselves afford, we maintain that no sufficient reason has been discovered for departing from the traditional view. We do not, of course, contend that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is defined, nor hold that the question of its inspiration is necessarily involved in that of authorship; neither do we undertake to say what censure the opinion of our adversaries would deserve. We simply say that the traditional view is in possession, and that no solid reason has ever been advanced for abandoning it.

On the other hand, all the Rationalists of Germany and England, and a very large number of Protestants who would not be called Rationalists, agree in rejecting the Mosaic authorship. In this negative position they all stand shoulder to shoulder, but when they proceed to build up a positive theory their ranks are rent by many and important differences, and theory gives place to theory, so that it is no easy matter to give the reader even a general idea of their present position. The following seems, to the writer, after careful study of many of their works, a fair outline of the conclusions on which they seem to a large extent agreed at present:—1. The Pentateuch is not the work of one writer, nor was it produced till centuries after Moses. 2. It is a compilation made from various documents which were originally independent. These documents were so united, that sometimes an entire narrative is taken from one or other of the documents; sometimes while the narrative as a whole is taken from one source, notices derived from another are incorporated with it; while sometimes the narrative is constructed of materials drawn from several sources in nearly equal proportions. 3. In regard to the number of documents, the favourite view at present seems to be that four documents were used by the compilers. These documents are called respectively—(a) the Jehovistic document, so named because in it God is called by the name *Jehovah*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Modern scholars are agreed that *Jehovah* is not the true pronunciation of the Hebrew *nomen incommunicabile*: that it is most probably *Jahve*, or *Jahove*. We prefer, however, in an article like the present, to retain the old familiar form of *Jehovah*.

(b) The Elohist document, so named because of its preference for the name *Elohim*, instead of *Jehovah*. (c) The Deuteronomistic document, which is contained in the book of Deuteronomy. (d) What is called the *Priests' Code* containing as a principal feature the laws of Jewish ceremonial. 4. As to the time at which these different documents were first written and afterwards united, there is greater difference of opinion. The following are the conclusions of Professor Driver, of Oxford, in the third edition of his *Introduction*, published this year. The Jehovistic and Elohist document, he says, are the oldest, and were written in the early centuries of the Jewish monarchy,<sup>1</sup> and united together by a compiler so as to form one narrative in the eighth century before Christ. Deuteronomy, founded upon the two preceding documents, belongs to a later period; but "it is probable that its composition is not later than the reign of Manasseh."<sup>2</sup> The *Priests' Code* belongs to a still later period, approximately to that of the Babylonian captivity, and "it is probable that the completed *Priests' Code* is the work of the age subsequent to Ezechiel."<sup>3</sup> These various documents were combined to form our present Pentateuch at a still later date; but the precise time, Professor Driver, as far as I can see, does not specify. Julius Wellhausen, the leading Rationalist critic of Germany, says the Pentateuch, in its present form was produced from the different documents about 444 B.C.; that is to say, about a thousand years after Moses.

Such are the conclusions of our modern "critics;" and these conclusions, first broached in Germany, have been gradually making their way into England, till this year they have been substantially adopted by a number of other English divines besides Professor Driver. Thus, A. F. Kirkpatrick, Regius Professor of Hebrew in Cambridge, says:—

"So far as the Pentateuch itself is concerned, we may safely come to the conclusion that it makes no claim to have been

<sup>1</sup> Saul, the first King, was anointed about 1095 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Manasses reigned 698-643 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Ezechiel was carried captive into Babylonia about 595 B.C.



written by Moses, and that we are free to examine what indirect evidence as to its origin can be derived from the books themselves. And it may be taken, as the accepted result of such an examination, that the Pentateuch is a composite work, which has grown into its present form by the combination of a plurality of documents.”<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, the Rev. W. E. Addis, from whom, perhaps, we could hope for nothing better, in *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, says:—

“We are able to distinguish the documents of the Pentateuch by divergencies of vocabulary and literary style, by their different and frequently contradictory views of history and religion, by the fact that we find the same statement made, or the same story told, twice over; and are, therefore, driven to the inference that we are dealing with more than one narrator, and that the superficial appearance of unity is fallacious.”<sup>2</sup>

We might cite also Dr. Wright, Bampton Lecturer for 1878 in the University of Oxford, and H. E. Ryle, Hulsean Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, in his early narratives of Genesis to prove their adhesion to the theory of the composite origin of the Pentateuch; but we will not tire the reader further, especially as enough has been said to show that the tendency of Protestant theological thought in England is to throw overboard the Mosaic authorship. England, it is plain, is beginning to feel the effects of German Rationalistic criticism; and, doubtless, before long we shall hear more of it than we do at present in Ireland.

If now we seek for the reasons of this momentous change—for it is a momentous change, destructive alike of the Mosaic authorship and of the hitherto recognised view of inspiration—doubtless we should expect to find overwhelming evidence to justify and even compel it. Surely, we are entitled to look for more than shallow conjecture and halting criticism, before we abandon the tradition of three thousand years, in which Origen and Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine, Aquinas and Anselm, Calmet and A Lapipe were content to acquiesce. Yet what do we find? For the most part arguments based upon a misunderstanding of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, page 43.

<sup>2</sup> *Documents of the Hexateuch*, page 14.

text, or on the assumption that what are in reality distinct accounts of similar events, are contradictory accounts of the same event, or on alleged differences of phraseology and style. Professor Driver in the work already referred to says :—

“As soon as the book<sup>1</sup> is studied with sufficient attention, phenomena disclose themselves which show incontrovertibly that it is composed of distinct documents or sources, which have been welded together by a later compiler or redactor into a continuous whole. These phenomena are very numerous; but they may be reduced in the main to the two following heads:—1. The same event is doubly recorded; 2. The language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in different sections.”

So too, Addis, in the passage already cited :—

“We are able to distinguish the documents of the Pentateuch by divergencies of vocabulary and literary style, by their different and frequently contradictory views of history and religion, and by the fact that we find the same statement made, or the same story told, twice over,” &c.

We have now obtained a general view of the conclusions of modern criticism, and of the nature of the arguments upon which it relies; and may, therefore, proceed at once to subject some of their arguments to examination, and test their value. Our adversaries cannot gainsay the right of criticism which they themselves have long exercised so freely, and to which they are so fond of referring

“Scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.”

It would be impossible in the space at our disposal to give any idea of the hundreds of difficulties which have been raised during the last century against our view; nor, indeed, would it serve any purpose to do so. Many of them have been long since given up by their authors, and upon such, of course, we shall not delay. We can neglect, therefore, difficulties founded on the similarity of style between the Pentateuch and the other books of the Old Testament, or on the fact that Moses is spoken of in the third person by the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Driver is speaking of the book of Genesis, but he holds exactly the same regarding Exodus and Numbers.

writer; the shallowness and absurdity of such objections has been long since recognised by the critics themselves. In like manner, we shall take no notice of difficulties founded upon the fact that the Pentateuch records miracles and prophecies, and must therefore be classed with the other mythical and legendary literature of antiquity. This is not the place to prove the possibility of the Creator's interfering with the ordinary laws of His own creation, or lifting before the eye of the prophet the veil that shrouds the future from mortal sight.

But there remains a very large number of difficulties, and from these we can do no more than make a selection. We shall, however, not shirk the issues, but discuss those which German and English critics alike regard as of most importance. Let us begin with that class which Professor Driver puts in the front; those, namely, which are based on the alleged fact, that the same event is doubly and contradictorily recorded. As an important instance of this, agreed upon by all critics, let us take the two opening chapters of Genesis, where we are told there is a double and contradictory account of creation. Professor Driver will put the difficulty:—

“Thus [he says] Genesis i. 1-ii. 4, and ii. 4-25, contain a double narrative of the origin of man upon earth. It might, no doubt, be argued *prima facie* that ii. 4 and following is intended simply as a more detailed account of what is described summarily in i. 26-30; and it is true that probably the present position of this section is due to the relation in which, speaking generally, it stands to the narrative of those verses; but, upon closer examination differences reveal themselves which preclude the supposition that both sections are the work of the same hand. In ii. 4, &c., the order of creation is:—1, man (v. 7); 2, vegetation (v. 9; cf. v. 5); 3, animals (v. 19); 4, woman (v. 21, and following). The separation made between the creation of woman and man, if it stood alone, might indeed be reasonably explained upon the supposition just referred to, that ii. 4. &c., describes in detail what is stated succinctly in i. 27; but the order in the other cases forms part of a progression evidently intentional on the part of the narrator here, and as evidently opposed to the order indicated in ch. i. (vegetation, animals, man).”

To this difficulty the ordinary reply of Catholic scholars

has been, that the second section, ii. 4, &c., is not a record of creation,<sup>1</sup> but the history of man in Paradise. In explaining man's original condition, Paradise is mentioned, and in connection with the preparation of Paradise for man, the production of vegetation is again referred to. And whereas in the first chapter only the *fact* of woman's formation is recorded, in the second chapter we learn, for the first time, the motive and manner of that formation. The second chapter, then, is not a repetition of the first, much less a contradictory repetition. Consistently with this view, it was held, that the creation of animals, v. 19, is not intended to be represented as chronologically consequent upon the creation of Adam, v. 7 ; but that v. 19 should be rendered "And the Lord God *had* formed," or, as in our Douay version :—"And the Lord God *having* formed out of the ground all the beasts of the earth," &c. ; and then as in the first chapter, the creation of animals may be regarded as chronologically anterior to the creation of man.

But at this point our adversaries interpose, and pronounce the rendering : "*had* formed," in verse 19, to be contrary to the Hebrew idiom.<sup>1</sup> Here, then, we are confronted with what, at first sight, seems a formidable difficulty ; unless we render "*had* formed" the creation of animals in ii. 19 is represented as following that of man, in opposition to chap. i., vv. 25-27 ; and yet, we may not render "*had* formed," "*because*," says Professor Driver, "it is contrary to the Hebrew idiom." Let us then examine the merits of this assertion of the Professor. In the Hebrew text of v. 19 we read :—**לִיצֵר יָחַד אֱלֹהִים** ; *i.e.* the imperfect with strong, *waw*, or, as it is usually called, *waw* conversive. Now the question is :—Are we justified in rendering an imperfect with *waw* conversive as a pluperfect ? Dr. Driver, in his "Introduction," replies in the negative, as we have seen ; but he gives no reason for his reply, and must, therefore, bear with us if we refuse to accept his *ipse dixit*.

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, Cornely, vol. ii., page 122 : "Duae relationes de creatione in Genesi tradi negamus."

<sup>2</sup> So, for instance, Professor Driver, page 7, note 1.



Fortunately, however, we have another work of the Professor:—*On the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, in which he discusses this very question of the use of the imperfect with *waw* conversive.<sup>1</sup> He begins the discussion with these significant words:—"It is a moot and delicate question how far the imperfect with *waw* conversive denotes a pluperfect;" and in the course of the discussion he is forced to admit that great Protestant authorities, like Professor Keil and *The Speaker's Commentary*, are in favour of the view that such an imperfect may have a pluperfect signification. Add to this the fact that *all* Jewish grammarians—who certainly ought to know—admit the same thing, and that St. Jerome, no mean authority on such a point, actually rendered the imperfect as a pluperfect in the text which we are discussing, and it will be seen that we are not speaking rashly when we assert that the Hebrew imperfect with *waw* conversive may be rendered by a pluperfect. Thus, our answer to the difficulty is complete; we deny that chap. ii. 4, &c., is a repetition of chap. i.; and we contend that where it does incidentally refer to the events recorded in chap. i., there is no chronological contradiction.

Another difficulty belonging to the same class as the preceding, is founded upon a comparison of Gen. xxvii. 1-45 with Gen. xxvii. 46-xxviii. 9.

"The section xxvii. 46-xxviii. 9 [says Dr. Driver] differs appreciably in style from xxvii. 1-46, and at the same time exhibits Rebecca as influenced by a different motive in suggesting Jacob's departure from Canaan, not as in xxvii. 42-45, to escape his brother's anger, but to procure a wife agreeable to his parents' wishes (see xxvi. 34 ff.)"

Can our adversaries be serious in proposing difficulties like this? Does it follow because Rebecca says to Jacob; "Behold Esau thy brother threateneth to kill thee. Now, therefore, my son, hear my voice; arise and flee to Laban my brother, to Haran; and thou shalt dwell with him a few days till the wrath of thy brother be assuaged:" does it follow, we say, that she may not also have suggested to her

<sup>1</sup>Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, pp. 102 and foll.

husband to send their son to the land of his fathers, that he might procure a wife of his own kindred? She may not have wished to disclose to her aged husband the fear which made her desirous of Jacob's departure, and so she took the most natural, and the most effective way of attaining her object by suggesting that Jacob should depart for Mesopotamia, and procure a wife of his own kindred. There is not a semblance of contradiction between the two narratives.

But it is especially the laws of the Pentateuch that, according to our adversaries, bristle with repetitions and contradictions. Again and again, they say, we meet with the same law needlessly repeated, or with what purports to be the same law, but is, in reality, a contradiction of it, showing clearly that both cannot have been written by the same hand. Before proceeding to examine any special instances of these alleged repetitions and contradictions, we must remind the reader of a fact to which we called attention in a previous article, namely, that the legislation of the Pentateuch is not codified, but that its different enactments were proclaimed and afterwards committed to writing, according as the exigencies requiring them arose. We must remember, too, that the legislation of the Pentateuch was promulgated in the desert when the Jewish people were in a state of transition from bondage to freedom, and we must not expect that a wise and provident legislator would intend precisely the same laws to guide and guard them while they dwelt together in a nomadic condition in the desert, and afterwards when they settled down, as they were so soon to do, in peaceful possession of the Promised Land.

Bearing this in mind, it will be no surprise to us if we find Moses modifying in Deuteronomy, a month or so before the entry into Palestine, the legislation of the earlier books, which was, in part, immediately intended to direct his countrymen in the desert. For instance, the law contained in Levit. xvii. 2-4, which seems to have bound the Jews, while encamped together around the tabernacle in the desert, to kill no animal (of a kind offered in sacrifice) without having first offered it at the door of the tabernacle, became impossible of fulfilment when the people were

scattered over the face of Palestine, far away from the sanctuary ; and, accordingly, we read in Deut. xii. 15, that it was repealed.

If, in addition to what has just been said, the legislation of the Pentateuch be examined in the light of the ordinary rules which guide the interpreters of any code of laws, it will be found that there is no difficulty in accounting for its repetitions and alleged contradictions. These rules are :—

1. That we are not at once to conclude, because several laws refer to the same subject, that there is therefore mere repetition ; it may be that one explains, or extends, or modifies another.
2. If an earlier law is contradicted by a later, the natural inference is that the earlier is thereby repealed ; yet, it may be allowed to remain in the text, in order by its presence to throw light on the law which has repealed it.

If jurists, in the interpretation of the Roman code, and canonists, when expounding the Decree of Gratian, are invariably governed by these principles, surely we have still stronger reason for applying them in the case of the legislation of Moses, which was promulgated in parts at various times, and never codified. Had Moses revised his legislation, and collected together, as a modern commentator might, all the laws bearing upon each subject, while he might still have retained some of the earlier laws, although revoked, in order to illustrate the later, doubtless we should have had some of them altogether expunged from the text. But he did nothing of the kind ; he left the Pentateuch as he had written it, with its laws arranged, not in logical, but chronological order ; and accordingly we, in explaining them, are bound to apply the ordinary and obvious rules of interpretation.

But now we are entitled to ask our adversaries : how is it if their theory is correct, if the Pentateuch is the work of a compiler who endeavoured to produce an harmonious and consistent whole from the various documents at his disposal, how is it that he allowed these repetitions and alleged contradictions to remain ? Is it that he was so blind as not to see what the most ordinary modern “ critic ” declares to be glaringly evident ? Or is it that, seeing these

repetitions and contradictions, he failed to see also the damaging effect they would have on the authority and character of the document he compiled? So, indeed, we are asked to believe. The Rev. W. E. Addis, in the work already referred to, published this year,<sup>1</sup> says :—

“The Hebrew historians, like the Arabic writers of a later day, had easy notions on historical evidence, and a compiler suffered discordant accounts to stand side by side. If the contradiction was startling, even to men of his age, he removed it or softened it : but it never occurred to him that the credit of one or other of the contradictory documents must be impaired.”

What a simpleton the Hebrew compiler must have been ! Evidently he little thought of the keen minds that were to arise in the nineteenth century to analyse his work, and mercilessly expose the conflicting character of his sources. But to be serious, our adversaries can make no plausible attempt to explain in their theory the existing form of Pentateuch legislation, so that this form, with its repetitions and *apparent* contradictions, so far from creating any difficulty, is a strong argument in favour of the Mosaic authorship.

After what we have said by way of a general reply, it will not be necessary to delay long upon individual difficulties founded on repetition or contradiction in the laws. Let us, however, take one or two cases. The law against eating blood is repeated five times in all, and four times in the one book of Leviticus ; but the explanation is to be found in the fact, that in each succeeding law in Leviticus something is added on to the preceding. Thus, Lev. iii. 17 : “ Neither blood nor fat shall you eat at all ; ” Lev. vii. 26, 27 : “ You shall not eat the blood of any creature whatsoever . . . everyone that eateth blood *shall perish* from among the people ; ” Lev. xvii. 10 : “ If any man whosoever of the house of Israel *and of the strangers* that sojourn among them, eat blood, &c. ; ” Lev. xix. 25 : “ You shall not eat *anything with* the blood ” (in it). Finally, in Deuteronomy, where Moses is summing up and commenting upon the laws of the preceding books, the same prohibition is repeated and

<sup>1</sup> *Documents of the Pentateuch*, page 43,



inculcated. Deut. xii. 22 : "Only be sure of this, that thou eat not the blood."

Another instance referred to by our adversaries as a case not so much of repetition as of contradiction between two laws, has regard to the release of Hebrew slaves.

"Thus [says Dr. Driver] while Levit. xxv. 39-43, enjoins the release of the Hebrew slave in the year of jubilee," in Deut. xv. 12-18, the legislator, *without bringing his new law into relation* with the different one of Leviticus, prescribes the release of the Hebrew slave in the seventh year of his service, implying that *fundamental institutions of the Priests' Code are unknown to the author of Deuteronomy.*"<sup>1</sup>

In reply to this, our first remark is, that the Professor either forgets or omits to mention a very important point, namely, that the law contained in the passage of Deuteronomy referred to has been already promulgated in Exod. xxi. 2 : "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee ; in the seventh year he shall go out free for nothing." Now, bearing this in mind, there is not a shadow of difficulty. First it is enjoined, Exod. xxi., that the Hebrew slave is to be released in the seventh year of his service ; afterwards in Levit. xxv., it is enjoined that he is to be released in the year of jubilee, which occurred only once in fifty years. It is as if Moses said : ordinarily a Hebrew slave must serve six years before he is released ; but if the year of jubilee occurs before he has served his six years, in that case he must be released as though he had completed his term. Then, summing up in Deuteronomy, he naturally refers again to the case of frequent occurrence ; that is to say, of release in the seventh year of service.

The laws regarding the place of sacrifice furnish, we are told, a clear case of hopeless contradiction.

"Still less [says Addis] is it reasonable to think that the same writer ascribed three contradictory codes to the same legislator, especially if the contradictions are striking and important. Some idea of the contradictions may be formed from the following samples. According to the *Book of the Covenant*,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Driver, page 77.

<sup>2</sup> By this name is meant the body of laws contained in Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 33.

sacrifice may be offered at many shrines, and the altar may be either of earth or of unhewn stone. (Exod. xx. 24.) According to the Deuteronomical code, liberty in this respect had been allowed for a season; but when the Israelites were settled in Canaan, they were to sacrifice only at one shrine specially chosen by God, and this central shrine was to be the one place of sacrifice for all the tribes. (Deut. xii. 1, *seq.*; xiv. 23, *seq.*; xvi. 2, *seq. et passim.*) According to the *Priests' Code*, sacrifice began in the wilderness at Sinai; it could be offered only at one place, viz., the altar of the tabernacle, so that there could be no question of offering sacrifice except at one place. Moreover, the Israelite had no choice as to the form of the altar. Its exact form and measurement were prescribed by Yahweh, and it was to be neither of earth nor stone, but of acacia wood covered with brass. Nor does the *Priests' Code*, like that of Deuteronomy, insist that sacrifice may be offered at one place only. Rather, it takes this for granted, and presupposes it in every sacrificial ordinance."<sup>1</sup>

We have given this objection at length, because it is urged as of great weight by all our adversaries. And yet what does it prove? Simply this, that the law regarding the place of sacrifice changed with the changed circumstances of the Jews. *During their first year in the desert*, when they had no tabernacle and no altar of holocausts, they were permitted to sacrifice upon altars of earth or of unhewn stone, which they might erect at different points in their march through the desert, according as the Lord would indicate to them. This was authorised by the law of Exod. xx. 24, 25, which was promulgated in the third month (Exod. xix. 1) of that first year. Afterwards, when the tabernacle and altar of holocausts were set up,<sup>2</sup> all sacrifice was to be offered at the tabernacle, which henceforth was to accompany the people through all their wanderings, in the desert. Then, when the people had settled down in Palestine, the law still recognised only one place of sacrifice, whether first at the tabernacle, or afterwards at the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. Thus, while, as we shall see in our next article, there is considerable difficulty arising from the non-observance of these laws regarding the place of

<sup>1</sup> Addis, page xiv.

<sup>2</sup> The tabernacle was not set up till the first day of the second year in the desert. (See Exod. xl. 2.)

sacrifice, there is none whatever in the character of the laws themselves, unless what our adversaries create by forgetting the various circumstances which the laws were designed to meet.

Here we must pause for the present. We have discussed some of the most serious difficulties against our view, and we hope we have convinced the reader that they leave that view still intact. If we seem to some to waste too many words on difficulties which dissolve at the first breath of honest and unprejudiced criticism, our apology must be that day after day such stuff is triumphantly dished up by men of standing as conclusive evidence against the Mosaic authorship.

JOSEPH M'RORY.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## ST. RUMOLD OF MECHLIN.

THE Cathedral of Mechlin is one of the most venerable Gothic structures in Europe. With all the characteristics of lightness and grace which distinguish the mediæval buildings of Flemish design—the long lines, the lofty windows, the fine moulding and elaborate tracery—there is still something grand and majestic about it, something which speaks of its metropolitan dignity and of its learned experience of times and personages, that have long since passed away. In the summer's night, when the details of architectural form are concealed from the view, the grand outlines of the building stand forth in their splendid dimensions, and look solemn and impressive as they tower aloft or cast their huge shadow on the open space beneath. In the daytime the hoary walls give their share of testimony to the gradual influences of time. The fretwork and floral decorations are worn and blurred. The corner-stones have lost their original sharpness. The arches and niches of the three great portals are crumbling with age. Here and there, a

moss-green hue, the surest sign of internal decay, finds its way to the surface, and spreads in growing patches over the sides and buttresses. The iron of the massive doors is corroded ; inscriptions are obliterated ; statues are disfigured ; symbols are defaced. But these marks of evident antiquity, far from diminishing the interest of the pile, surround it, on the contrary, with charms of peculiar beauty and attractiveness. For, as the old chimes, that for centuries have warned the people of Mechlin of departed time, become more perfect with age, and tell the lapse of the hour in tones ever more musical and more sweetly blended, these walls, in like manner, now stained and weather-beaten, seem invested with a spiritual significance of more telling import in proportion to their antiquity and to the memories that cling around them. The interior of the church presents some special features of combination and disposition which depart a good deal from the pure Gothic ; but the great nave is lofty and wide, and the aisles, though plain, are long and symmetrical. Two of the largest stained-glass windows in Europe, with ten bays in each, fill the gable walls of the northern and southern transepts, and shed a full but mellow light on the objects underneath. Of these one of the most important is Vandyck's great painting of the Crucifixion, which competent judges have pronounced to be one of the first pictures in the world. Several other masters of the Flemish school are also represented here in the side chapels or along the aisles, amongst them John Van-Eyck, Michel Coxis, Adrian Bloemert, and Gaspard Crayer.

The choir is chiefly remarkable for its fine oak-stalls of later Gothic design, and for the sarcophagi that are erected around it over the tombs of the Archbishops of Mechlin. The marble High Altar was constructed in 1666, and there, beneath its spacious table, lie still, in solemn repose, the relics of St. Rumold, the first Apostle and Bishop of Mechlin, the patron of the city and diocese, the father and the founder in whose name the Cathedral was built and dedicated to the worship of God. The shrine that contains the relics of the patron is the most precious treasure of Mechlin, and the one most highly valued by its people.



For with it the history of their city is most intimately bound up. It recalls to them the scenes of bygone splendour and of ardent faith that were witnessed in their streets, and that fill their annals for eleven centuries. It reminds them of the sacrifices and struggles of their ancestors for the rights of conscience and of religious liberty. It is even associated with their bravest efforts in the cause of civil freedom. Hence it is richly adorned with gems and precious stones, and is kept, as in a strong place or citadel, in the High Altar of their great Cathedral, where it represents to the mind and to the imagination of a religious people a whole creed and a history to which that creed gave life and form.

In literature, St. Rumold has occupied the attention of a good many writers. His first biography was written by an author whose name is unknown; but, from the analogies of style and idiom, it is clear that it must have been written at an early date. It was composed originally in Latin, but survived only in a Belgic dialect of the German language. This version in the vulgar tongue was believed to have been written in the monastic age, and long before the Minnesängers had come to develop and expand the language of the Teutons; but on closer examination and subsequent comparison with the model works of that period, such as the *Heliand* or the *Krist* of Ottfried, it was found that even when allowance was made for local transitions and the outward influences that affect all languages in the course of their development, it was impossible to trace the affinity to the same age of German literature or to a period earlier than the eleventh century. The fact, however, that the original Latin, from which it was taken, had time to be written and to disappear, gives us some notion of its antiquity. In 1569 the work was retranslated<sup>1</sup> into Latin by a priest named Johan Domeyns, pastor at Mechlin, and the translation was accompanied by comments and glosses of considerable value. Another Life of the saint was written in Latin about 1104, by a monk named Theoderic,

<sup>1</sup> *Divi Archipraesulis Christique Mart. Rumoldi, Machliniensium Praesidis sive Tutelarîs Eximia Vita, Abs Johanne Domyns.*

of the monastery of St. Trudo or St. Trond near Brussels. It is not so complete as the other, and is more in the style of a panegyric.<sup>1</sup> All the subsequent lives are based upon these two. In 1638 St. Rumold found a very distinguished biographer in the person of Johan Van Wachtendonck, Canon of the Cathedral, and afterwards Bishop of Namur and Archbishop of Mechlin. His work was written in Latin, but was translated into Flemish by Francis Van den Bosche, pastor of the Church of St. James at Antwerp. In the following year, a priest of the Oratory, named John Anthony Gurnez Van Stavelo, published a Life of St. Libertus who had, when a child, been miraculously saved from drowning by Rumold; a good part of this work is devoted to the life of the Irish Apostle. About the year 1626, Father Hugh Ward of Tyrconnell, a Franciscan of the Minor Observants of the College of St. Anthony, at Louvain, wrote the most learned and important work that has ever appeared about St. Rumold. The Irish nationality of the saint having been questioned by some Scotch and English writers, Father Ward sets forth in splendid array the arguments which establish Ireland's claim to the satisfaction of any reasonable and unprejudiced mind. The learned Franciscan did not live, unfortunately, to finish his work; but it was put into shape and published some years after his death by one of his brethren, Father Thomas Sirinus.<sup>2</sup> It was dedicated to the illustrious Andrew Creusen, Archbishop of Mechlin, and Primate of Belgium, a great friend of Ireland in the days of persecution, and a man so full of zeal for the honour of St. Rumold, that he erected at his own expense the present magnificent High Altar of the Cathedral, and had the relics of the saint transferred and laid beneath it in a fitting and permanent resting-place. Father Ward draws his arguments from the old martyrologies of Germany, Belgium, and England; from legends, breviaries, missals, histories, chronicles, pictures; from the

<sup>1</sup> See A. Baillet, *Vie des Saints; St. Rumold Evêque de Dublin en Irlande, Patron de Malines.*

*De Vita, Passione et Miraculis Sancti Rumoldi, Archiepiscopi Dublin, et Apostoli Mochlimensis, Antwerpia.* Typis Henr. Jaye, 1634.

<sup>2</sup> The Latinized name of Father Thomas O'Sheerin, Professor at Louvain.

names of persons and places. He accumulates proofs, native and foreign, extrinsic and intrinsic, negative and positive, with such force as to do away, effectively and for ever, with the claims of any country except Ireland. By this work Ireland's right has been established once and for all, and who ever doubts it has only to be referred to Father Ward.

In the year 1667, the learned J. B. Grammaye, Provost of Louvain, published the *Antiquitates Civitatis Machliniensis*, and the references to St. Rumold contained therein were collected and translated into the vernacular for the benefit of the people, by Peter de Nielis, a Belgian prelate of the Court of Rome. In the year 1680, the jubilee of the saint was celebrated at Mechlin with extraordinary pomp and solemnity, and a popular Life of the saint was written for the occasion, in low Dutch, by Augustine Casimir Redel, Professor of Theology in the Seminary of Mechlin. In 1718, the Jesuit Jean Baptiste du Solier, a voluminous writer, better known as Sollerius, published his *Acta Sancti Rumoldi*, in which he discusses in a highly critical spirit and with considerable acumen and learning, the arguments of Father Ward. Whilst not positively denying Ireland's claim to St. Rumold, he holds that it is possible the saint may have been an Anglo-Saxon, who studied in Ireland, like St. Willibrord, apostle of the Frisians. His work, though well brought out and beautifully illustrated, is wanting both in clearness and accuracy. He was drawn away in his arguments into side issues, and lost sight of the main question and the main arguments of the author whom he criticizes. He gives Father Ward, however, full credit for his learning and ability, and admits that he has placed beyond all doubt, the fact, that Ireland alone was called "Scotia" by all early historians.<sup>1</sup> That, however, he said, was not the question to be decided. The point at issue was whether Rumoldus came from Scotia at all. But, inasmuch as his oldest biographers, on whom alone we can rely in such matters, state distinctly that he was Bishop of Dublin,

<sup>1</sup> "Solide ostendit nullam antiquis historicis cognitam fuisse Scotiam, præter eam quam nunc Hiberniam dicimus insulam, adeoque in hypothesi recte concludit Sanctum Rumoldum, si scotus fuerit, Hibernum fuisse."

and that he came from the same island near Britain as Columbanus, Fursaeus, Kilian, and Bertinus, who were all natives of Scotia, the answer is plain enough.<sup>1</sup> In the year 1763, Gerrard-Dominick de Azevedo, a priest of the Collegiate Church of our Lady beyond the Dyle at Mechlin, published a work on the *Life, Sufferings, and Miracles of St. Rumold*. This work, in octavo, was republished in Brussels, in 1775. About this time the centenary of St. Rumold came round again, and was celebrated by a large number of works in poetry and prose, in Latin,<sup>2</sup> French, and Flemish. It was to commemorate this jubilee that the celebrated archaeologist, J. de Munck, wrote and published his work on St. Rumold. This volume, in old Flemish, is full of interest.<sup>3</sup> Everything directly or indirectly connected with the saint—annals, books, churches, oratories, statues, documents, pictures, medals, memorials of every kind—were examined by this painstaking investigator, and the result of his inquiries is set forth in his work with the utmost clearness and precision. It is interesting to us, above all, that he accepts fully Father Ward's conclusions as to Rumold's origin. Ireland was, according to him, and beyond all doubt, the saint's birthplace.<sup>4</sup> The arguments of Sollerius, therefore, produced no impression on him. Indeed they seem rather to have confirmed everyone in their belief in the old tradition; for in every Life of the saint that subsequently appeared, Ireland alone is given as his birthplace. This happy result was also due in great measure to the action of the Archbishops of

<sup>1</sup> "Assentit in hoc Hierbipolis, gloriosa Martyris Kiliani meritis et corpore, nec minus Peroma Scotorum talium et tantorum patrum gloriosa veneratione. Columbanus Italiam, Bertinus illustravit occidentalem Galliam et innumerales alii, suis quisque in locis, qui vitae sinceritate et fidei integritate multos ad justitiam erudierunt et quasi stellae fulgent in perpetuas aeternitates."

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Sancti Rumoldi, Urbis Mechliniensis Patroni Carmine Pastoritio. Fama Belgica Carmine Paucyprico. Klaerblinckende Lichte ofte het Wonderboer Leven Van den H. Rumoldus door J. Pauwels in Nederduytsche Dicht-konst.*

<sup>3</sup> *Gedenck-Schrijften, Dienende Tot Ophelderinge van Het Leven, Lyden, Wonderheyden ende Duyscet-Jaerige Eer-bevusinge, van den Heyligen Bisschop ende Marteloer Rumoldus, Apostel ende Patroon van Mechelen; door J. de Munck, Mechelen, 1777. Johan Francis Van der Elst.*

<sup>4</sup> "Den Heyligen Rumoldus is geboren uyt eenen Koninglycken stam in het Eyland van Schottland nu Ierland genoemt."



Mechlin. Thus we find that at a synod of the clergy held in the Cathedral, in 1740, Jerome Stevart, Dean of the Chapter, delivered a Latin discourse to the assembled clergy, at the request of the Archbishop, in which he denounced the work of Sollerius in strong language<sup>1</sup> for having without a shadow of foundation, attempted to interfere with the long received tradition regarding the Irish origin of their patron saint—a tradition which was confirmed by the judgment and approval of such learned men as Baronius, Surius, Molanus, Rosweyd, Wachendonek, and hundreds of others. This new theory, he said, went against the evidence of the most venerable tradition, of innumerable histories, martyrologies, inscriptions, missals, breviaries, monuments of every descriptions. And he added, moreover, that the saint's Irish birth was ever held by the Archbishops of Mechlin; and that, from the days of the illustrious Cardinal Granvelle down to those of Alphonsus de Berghes, the arms of Ireland were mingled on the shield of the Archbishop for the time with those of his own race and family.

The old and authentic tradition has thus definitely prevailed, and is now acknowledged in the Breviaries of Belgium and in all the sermons, panegyrics, and local *Lives of the Saints*.<sup>2</sup> It was also adopted in Rome in the Breviary of St. John Laterans, from which the office of our Irish Breviary is taken; and Pope Benedict XIV., writing to the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, in 1741, reckons St. Rumold

...<sup>1</sup> "Audite hæc quæ ultimi illi Vitæ Sancti Rumoldi Editores, contra receptissimam traditionem, contra præfatos historicos, contra innumera antiqua martyrologia, agiologia, necrologia, Missalia, Breviaria, et alia veneranda monumenta, scripserunt." And, after explaining and refuting their views, he continues: "Rumoldus natus est in ea parte Scotiæ quæ nunc Hybernia dicitur; antiqua traditio et vetusta monumenta hoc asserunt et hanc traditionem admiserunt Archi-Episcopi Mechlinienses, quia omnes in honorem et memoriam Patroni ut Scotorum regis filii, a Card. Granvellano usque ad illustrissimum Alphonsum de Berghes, insignia sua gentilitia cum insignibus regni Scotiæ mixta in uno scuto gestarunt. Capitulum autem hoc Metropolitanum jam dudum et adhuc hodiedum insignia regni Scotiæ gerit."

<sup>2</sup> The only exception is Hillegeer, in his *België en Seine Heiligen*, vol. ii., page 105. He, however, only follows his brother Jesuit, Du Solier; and this only hesitatingly, for he says, "De H. Rumoldus, zoo het schijnt, werd geboren bij de Anglo-Saksers in Engeland."

with Columbanus, Kilian, and Virgilius, as one of the glories of Ireland.<sup>1</sup>

The last work of special importance that was published in connection with St. Rumold, appeared in Brussels, in 1847. It is entitled, *Vie et Miracles de St. Rombaut; Né en Irlande et Patron de la Ville de Malines*. It was edited and published by E. Vandale. It is a large volume in double folio, and, besides a Life of the Saint, it contains thirty splendid plates representing the pictures of the scenes in the life of St. Rumold, now in the Cathedral, most of which were painted by a well-known master of the Flemish school, named Michel Coxis. Each plate is accompanied by a description and history, and beneath it are inscribed the lines of quaint old Flemish verse, which was written at the foot of the panel by the worthy painter. A life that has proved of such progressive interest to the people of Belgium, has, we imagine, no small claim on the attention of Ireland; for it was here that the seed was planted which grew into such a splendid tree; and the flowers that it has borne, and the fragrance it has shed, and the ripe fruit that it has yielded, through succeeding generations, can be duly traced to the care with which it was tended in its early years.

St. Rumold was born towards the end of the seventh century, or early in the commencement of the eighth. Most of the ruling classes in Ireland in those days were thoroughly Christian. The father of the saint was, it is said, Dathy, King of Leinster, and probably a descendant of the well-known historical character of the same name, whilst his mother was a daughter of the King of Cashel. The parents were both advanced in age at the time of Rumold's birth; and the fact that their hopes of offspring were finally satisfied, was attributed to the prayers of St. Walafer, then Bishop of the Capital of Leinster. The heir and only child became naturally the object of unusual attentions. During his childhood a Christian mother implanted in his heart the germs of virtue that were one day to prove so fruitful. At an early age he was entrusted to the care of St. Walafer,

<sup>1</sup> De Burgo, *Hibernia Dominicana*, page 21.

who undertook in person the charge of his education. When approaching manhood he returned to his parents. He was then, according to his biographers, an amiable and accomplished youth, who, at the same time, gave promise of all the strong intellectual qualities necessary to make him a wise and capable ruler. But Rumold ambitioned a heavenly crown, and made up his mind to leave the earthly one to the enjoyment of others. Notwithstanding the entreaties of his parents, and especially of his mother, he bade farewell to the luxuries of his father's house and to the brilliant worldly career that opened up before him, and entered one of the monastic establishments then so numerous in his native province. Far from claiming any privileges here on account of his high lineage and superior education, Rumold, on the contrary, became a model to his brethren in all practical humility and in the strictest observance of discipline; and his virtue and attainments were so well proved, and became so universally acknowledged, that on the death of the saintly prelate, Walafer, he was chosen to succeed him as Bishop of Dublin.<sup>1</sup> It was not, however, in order to exchange the pomp of the world for the power and prestige of a great position in the Church, that Rumold had rejected a principality and refused a crown. We are told, therefore, that during the time he held his bishopric in Ireland he became to all men a living example of holiness; that he gave whatever he possessed to the poor, retaining only what was absolutely necessary for himself; that in the midst of his labours he fasted and prayed and watched unceasingly; and that in his long vigils at night he conversed with the angels of heaven, who guided and directed him. It was in one of these favoured moments that he received a warning from above that a trial was in store for him; for the leaders of his kingdom were determined to insist that he and he alone should succeed his father, and under the circumstances unite in his person the double office of spiritual and temporal ruler. Then he

<sup>1</sup> The order of Bishops of Dublin, given in Ware's *History of the Bishops*, published by Harris, is :—Livinus, Wiro, Dysibod, Gualafer, Rumold. Dr. Lanigan, without, we must confess, giving much reason for his strong language, denounces this order of succession as arbitrary and unfounded.



thought how the Lord, whom he had chosen absolutely as his model, left the kingdom of His Father in heaven, and came upon earth, a sufferer and an exile, to prove His love of men by shedding His blood, and dying on a Cross for their salvation; and he resolved that, for his part, he should make the sacrifice of his earthly kingdom complete. He accordingly disposed of whatever goods he possessed; and, in order to escape from the plans and projects of his people, literally stole away from his native land, never to return. He embarked on a little boat formed of woven branches, lined with hides and covered with pitch. In this way he reached England, and afterwards passed over to France and Germany. But Rome, in the first instance, was the term on which his eyes were fixed. For in these days Rome was also the Holy City, the centre of Christendom in authority and jurisdiction; and the heads of the Irish Church, following in the footsteps of St. Patrick, were Roman as they were Christian. Stephen II. then occupied the Papal throne; and we are told that when the Irish bishop was brought into his presence, he threw himself at Stephen's feet, and kissed them with reverence; and then, in acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Pope, he took from his finger the ring which he had received at his consecration, and which is the symbol of plighted faith and devoted union to the diocese committed to a bishop's charge, and asked the Sovereign Pontiff to take it back from him, that he might be free to preach the Gospel to those who were in darkness, and, if the occasion arose, to seal with his blood his devotion to Jesus Christ. The Pope was moved by the prayers of Rumold, and, although with some hesitation, consented to gratify his desires and accept his resignation. Full of gratitude for this favour, the saint next visited the tombs of the holy Apostles, and with profuse tears prayed to Almighty God that he might be worthy to receive the martyr's crown. Having been warned in a vision that the district which required his preaching most was situated in Belgic Gaul, at the part where the Scheld flows into the sea, he went once more to the Sovereign Pontiff to ask his blessing, and to beg of him to confirm his mission, and



to bestow certain indulgences on the land marked out for his labours. Fortified by the blessing and encouragement of the Pontiff, Rumold now set out on his journey northwards.

The progress of the saint both to and from the Holy City was marked by frequent miracles. In several places he restored sight to the blind and cast out demons. When after a fruitful journey he arrived at Brabant, near the Scheld, he recognised the spot which heaven had marked out for his zeal. He therefore fixed his abode on the site of the present city of Mechlin. The district was then a desert waste. Great trees, in which the birds of the marshy swamps congregated at night, grew all around it. Thickets of rough and tangled brushwood offered a retreat beneath them to foxes and wolves. In such surroundings Rumold arrived one day, in the midst of a crowd of the inhabitants engaged in dance and boisterous mirth. It was the season of our Lord's Passion, and the contrast was keenly felt by the apostle. At once, therefore, he began to preach the truths of the Gospel, and was listened to by the crowd, first with curiosity, then with respect. Gradually his words became effectual, and the grace of his apostolate soon began to work on the minds and hearts of his hearers.

The civil ruler of all this country was at that time a Count named Ado, a relative of Pepin of Herristal. He was a fervent Christian, and was most anxious for the conversion of his subjects. He was married to a noble lady named Adelise of Hesbaye; and both husband and wife were delighted when they heard that an apostle of extraordinary energy had come amongst their people, and that, owing to his preaching, the Gospel was spreading far and wide. They accordingly offered the saint not only their protection and encouragement, but also the hospitality of their house, and the benefit of their help and advice. For their generous efforts in the cause of Christianity, they were soon rewarded by the birth of a son, who was baptized by Rumold, and named Libertus. For years their marriage had not been fruitful, and they attributed the blessing that was conferred upon them chiefly to the prayers of the saint, who was himself a child of grace. As a result they became doubly zealous in seconding the efforts of the good apostle.

From the retired place in which St. Rumold had built himself a hermitage he went forth to the surrounding countries to preach and instruct. Crowds gathered to hear him, and were baptized and confirmed. It was during these years of comparative tranquillity that the chief objects of his mission were accomplished. At a certain distance from Rumold's dwelling there lived at the same time a saintly recluse, named Gomer, or Gundemar, who had been one of King Pepin's military companions and counsellors, but who had now retired from the world and its vanities. Midway between their domiciles the two saints were accustomed to meet, under the shadow of the oaks, and there to converse on the progress of religion and the ways of spiritual perfection. At the site of their meeting-place there is now a village, which still bears the name of *Stand-Eycke*. Legends have been busy in manufacturing its history, and to this day it exercises a religious fascination over the clergy and people of the country around it. As the two saints were one day engaged in their usual conference, a messenger arrived in haste to inform the bishop of an unfortunate accident which had happened in the family of Ado, his friend and patron. As the little boy Libertus, whom Rumold himself had baptized only a few years before, was playing with his companions on the banks of the Dyle, he pursued some small birds with such eagerness, that, not seeing the water before him, he stepped into the river, was carried away by the current, and drowned. The grief of the father and mother,<sup>1</sup> when they heard what had happened, need not be described. It was simply boundless. Every effort was made to recover the body of the child. Men who could swim and dive

<sup>1</sup> The Latin account of the whole event in the life of the saint by Domynisius is very graphic and interesting. It proceeds:—"Hic tanta cura nutritus filiulus cum coequalibus juxta lympham lusitans, dum volitantes aviculas indefesse sectaretur nimiumque fideret ripae in flumen ipsum praeceps abiens immergitur. Cujus rei certior redditus genitor, plorans amarissimeque flens, suas complicabat manus atque sublatis in ethera oculis inquebat. O Pater omnipotens quid in te tantum committere potui ut hocce jam me moerore, afficias? Quando enim in mentem venit dies ille quo me, pro tua benignitate, exhilaraveris, donando nimirum partum mihi quem misere adeo acerba mors abripuit, subito dolore discrucior. Hen! quid mihi jam commodi erit e subole generosa quam enis: est mea conjux tam repente e medio erepta? Gaudium meum ac lactitia evanescere

searched the river, and others used nets, hooks, and drags; but all was useless. It was then that Rumold was sent for. The bishop hastened at once to the scene of the catastrophe, and there on the banks of the river, and in the presence of a great crowd, he raised his eyes to heaven, and prayed the Almighty God to restore Libertus to his parents and to life. Before he had concluded his prayer the boy appeared before him, as if awakening from sleep, without any stain or sign of moisture on his body or on his garments. The impression produced by this wonderful miracle was deep and lasting. The event itself is now related in every account of St. Rumold's life. It is commemorated in paintings and shields, in old engravings and in medals, in poetry<sup>1</sup> and in prose. Even in the old sequence that used to be said in the Mass of St. Rumold, we find the verses:—

“ O Rumolde Martyr sancte  
 Aurem praebe laudi tantae  
 Servis patrocinia  
 Qui liquisti facultates  
 Et regales dignitates  
 Paupertatis gratia.  
 Justis foetu desperatis  
 A te verbis veritatis  
 Filius promittitur.  
 Idem natum baptizasti  
 Quem post mortem revocasti  
 Flumine dum mergitur.”

There are, no doubt, many persons nowadays who find it difficult to believe unconfirmed stories of this kind when they hear them seriously related. Nor do we desire to attach to them more importance than they really

simul. O mi generose nate, flos, speculum et decor puerorum omnium post hac haud mihi licebit te tanquam filio fruisce neque in paternas successurus es opes ditionemque. Certior deinceps facta atque de adversa filii fortuna edocta mater, ne verbulum quidem prae dolore nimio effare potuit: at animi deliquium passa est ita at opus fuit eam ab inde abducere.” Hugo Vardaëus, page 31.

<sup>1</sup> In the hymn of St. Rumold's feast we find:—

“ Prole mox chara steriles beasti  
 Hospites, mersum rapidis sub undis  
 Jamque defunctum revocas Libertum  
 Lucis in auras.”

deserve. Belief in them is not imposed upon anyone. To the miracles of the Gospel we give the assent at once of reason and of faith. We believe with implicit and absolute credence in the acts of the early martyrs which are duly authenticated, and in the miracles of all canonized saints which have the impress of the Church. But there are certain wonderful deeds attributed to saints of a later epoch, which belong more to oral tradition and to legend than to authentic history. They may be true, or there may be some foundation for them which was magnified and embellished as the story passed from one generation to another. But they are not matters of faith. Nobody is compelled to give either internal or external assent to them. In the present case, tradition has merely handed us certain facts, which are not impossible in themselves. But whilst the records that contain them are not sufficient to establish anything like scientific certainty, we must remember at the same time that they are attributed to a man who resigned a kingdom and a bishopric in order to lead a life of extraordinary sacrifice, and who finally died a martyr's death.<sup>1</sup> Certain it is, that the saint, whose memory has been enshrined in the hearts of a people for eleven centuries, must have led no ordinary life and done no ordinary deeds; and when we are told that the laws of nature sometimes yielded to his prayers—taking into account the miraculous foundation of Christianity, and the wholesale conversion of people hitherto steeped in superstition, ignorance, and vice, which was wrought by the early missionaries—we think it extremely probable that in this particular case events of the kind should have occurred. To brush them aside as unlikely or impossible would be to set ourselves up as the judges of the wisdom of Providence, or to take our place in the ranks of those who hold that nature's laws are as immutable as the Eternal Himself and are as incapable as He is of either suspension or increase of power.

<sup>1</sup> Libertus also at an early age devoted himself completely to religion, and finally died a martyr.



At all events, we are told that Ado, in the fulness of his gratitude, offered the saint a great quantity of gold and silver as a reward for the life of his child. But these gifts were rejected, and all that Rumold asked was the possession of a suitable spot for a church and residence, in which he might spend his old age, and where he could instruct and train those who were anxious to lead a religious life. This demand was readily agreed to, and the saint was allowed to choose the place that suited him best. In order not to inconvenience anyone, he decided to take for his purpose a secluded spot which was surrounded by elms, and which produced at the time nothing but alder-trees, yews, and brambles. On this site St. Rumold built a church in honour of the proto-martyr St. Stephen, and established a sort of monastery, where, besides many others, the young Libertus came to join him in religious life.

Here, in his instructions to the people around him, Rumold often inveighed against the vices of immorality, to which many were addicted. One of his neighbours, who was well known as an adulterer, feeling acutely the reproaches of the saint, conceived a deadly hatred against him. To revenge himself on Rumold, he entered into a plot with some wicked workmen who knew the habits of the saint, and were willing to murder him in the hope of being well paid. They accordingly seized him one evening, as he was preparing to pay his labourers, and taking him, without warning or mercy, to a lonely place in the woods, they struck him on the head and killed him. In order, if possible, to leave no trace of their horrible crime, the murderers then took the body to the river side, and cast it into the water, covering with large branches of trees the place in which it was submerged. Over the spot where it lay a light was seen, by fishermen, shining in the darkness of the night ; and when Ado heard of all that had happened, he came in person to the place, and had the body reverently lifted from the water. He was full of grief at the loss of his best friend, and horrified that anyone should have been so barbarous as to do him harm. Every honour that could now be shown to the remains of the bishop, was duly paid by the

people and by the prince. In the church which Rumold himself had built his body was laid to rest, and over his grave a suitable mausoleum was erected by Ado.

Thus perished St. Rumold, on the 24th of June, 775. It was the feast of St. John the Baptist, who, centuries before, had braved the anger of the tyrant Herod and of his adulteress spouse, and who, though imprisoned and beheaded in the dungeon of Macheronte, maintained to the last the rights of outraged society against passion sustained by power. It was for the denunciation of similar crimes that Rumold was now sacrificed; that Livinus was murdered in the groves of Alost; that Killian shed his blood on the plains of Franconia, done to death by the emissaries of the unchaste Geilana; and that Columbanus,<sup>1</sup> the greatest of our missionaries, was driven from his monastic home in Burgundy by the corrupted grandson of the dissolute Brunehilde.<sup>1</sup>

On the conduct of these courageous churchmen of Irish birth and blood the same reflection suggests itself which was made on the martyrdom of St. John the Baptist, by an archbishop who, in modern times, and within our own

<sup>1</sup> Columban ne lutta pas contre la royauté mais contre un seul roi et il livra cette lutte dans le seul intérêt de la pureté et de la dignité du mariage chrétien. Il est impossible de découvrir dans sa biographie, si remplie de minutieux détails, la moindre trace d'une préoccupation politique. Bien loin d'être un ennemi de la royauté il fut sans contredit celui des grandes moines de son temps qui eut les relations les plus fréquentes et les plus cordiales avec les rois contemporains; avec Clotaire, rois des Neustriens; Theodebert, roi des Austrasiens; Agilulfe, roi des Lombards. Mais il savait que la vertu et la vérité sont faites pour les rois comme pour les peuples. L'histoire doit admirer en lui l'intégrité monastique aux prises avec le paganisme rétrograde de la polygamie mérovingienne et le missionnaire étranger et solitaire retrouvant de prime saut, en face des conquérants de la Gaule, la liberté des prophètes de l'ancienne loi contre la débauche corrompue.—"Loquebar in testimoniis tuis in conspectu regum et non confundar." Il y a cela; il n'y a pas autre chose; celas suffit à sa gloire. gloire.—Montalembert, *Les Moines D'Occident*," vol. ii., page 532.

<sup>2</sup> "Le paganisme vaincu dans les esprits se réfugiait dans les passions; c'était là qu'il devait faire une défense désespérée. Kilian paraissait à la cour de Thuringe, comme Colomban à celle d'Austrasie pour commencer ce long combat de l'église contre l'impudicité des grands, qui remplit tout le moyen âge où l'on n'a vu que la rivalité de deux puissances, mais où il s'agissait de toute la société chrétienne et de savoir qui resterait maître du monde, l'esprit ou la chair." —*La Civilisation Chrétienne chez les Francs*, by A. F. Ozanam, page 138.

memory, was brutally persecuted, and finally murdered by the enemies of all morality and of all religion :—

“There is nothing more glorious [wrote this illustrious prelate] than to struggle and to suffer in defence of the eternal principles of righteousness and truth. For he who becomes a victim in the interests of these does not altogether die. The present life has its morrow, when the sorrows of this earth are weighed in the scale of absolute justice. If suffering is often made the basis of the destiny of virtuous men, it is only in order that they may reach through its purifying influence to higher stages of glory. The blood that is generously shed by the champions of a noble cause, will shine, as if it were changed into pearls, in the diadem of their immortality. The protest of a life never goes for nought, and to the honour of the human race it must be said, that when one falls for truth and virtue, a thousand arise to fill his place. Those who suffer may, therefore, abide in patience, for in the long run they are sure to conquer; as for those who trample and persecute, they may triumph in this world, but they cannot escape the eternity that awaits them, and the justice that reigns supreme on the other side.”

It would be impossible for us to attempt to relate here the almost innumerable miracles that are attributed to St. Rumold after his death and down to the present time. When war or pestilence, heresy or internal dissensions, troubled the city, the burgesses of Mechlin had public recourse to their patron, and their annals and monuments bear ample testimony that it was never had in vain. The works of Father Ward, of Du Solier, and De Munck, are full of the evidences of this powerful protection; and the confidence with which the Flemish peasants still pray to their “Heilige Bisschop en Martelaar,” is the best proof that his intercession has been effective. When his festival is celebrated, on the 1st of July, the silver chimes of all the churches and public institutions in Mechlin, ring out in full concert, awakening the city from its slumbers in the early morning, and sending up to heaven, through the pure air, the first notes of the gratitude of a people. Later on the well-filled churches give some idea of the strength and vitality of the faith which

St. Rumold brought from Ireland and from Rome; and in the evening the old cathedral, crowded to its doors, echoes the Latin chant of clergy and of people :—

“Sterne te totam, generosa quanta es .  
Civitas, tanti tumulo patroni,  
Orna et exorna meliora gemmis  
Martyris ossa.

Sancte, nunc Urbis, decus, O Rumolde,  
Civibus dona benedictionem,  
Urbis et totum regimen teneto  
Jure sepulchri.

Haeresim, pestem, fera bella, morbos  
Finibus nostris procul, O, repelle ;  
Adjuva sanctis precibus clientes,  
Sancte Rumolde.

Fac uti te qua licet aemulantes  
Te triumphantem comitemur illuc,  
Nunc ubi aeterna frueris salute,  
Sancte Rumolde.”

Every twenty-five years the jubilee of the saint is celebrated, and it is only on such occasions that the relics, in their splendid shrine, are taken from their place in the altar, and borne in procession through the streets. Then all Belgium has its share in the celebration, which is in every sense a national festival.

There are several other churches besides the cathedral dedicated to St. Rumold in the diocese of Mechlin. The most interesting are these at Humbeck and Steynockerzeel. The “*Collège de St. Rombaut*,” at Mechlin itself, is also an important institution, under the special patronage of the saint. To its learned and hospitable director, the Abbé Bucklandt, we owe the chief part of the great interest we found on every side, during a short visit to Mechlin, in the course of last summer.

There is, perhaps, nothing that gives a better idea of the regard of the Malinois for their patron saint than the history of the shrines in which his relics were kept. During

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Sancti Rumoldi*, Sollerius, page 58.



the invasion of the barbarians, the body of the saint was transferred to the Church of Steynockerzeel, a village, some miles distant from Mechlin; but when the troubles subsided they were brought back to the city. In the year 1365, a magnificent silver shrine was made for the reception of the relics, by a goldsmith at Antwerp, at the expense of the bishop and citizens. It was placed in the keeping of the canons and aldermen of the city. Three large sapphires were inserted in it at different parts, and in the course of years it was very richly ornamented, and became very costly. When the "Gueux," or reformers, invaded Mechlin, in 1578, under the Prince of Orange, this precious monument of the piety of the people was taken to pieces and destroyed. The Catholics were greatly afflicted at the loss of such a treasure. But, in 1585, when Mechlin was restored to the Crown of Spain, the relics, which had been carefully concealed in a secret place, were transferred to a new reliquary. This one, however, not being considered fine enough, in the year 1617, the canons and magistrates made a collection in the city, and entered into a contract at Antwerp for a new shrine. The agreement and the design were approved of, and signed by the Archduke Albert, and Isabella, his wife. The result was a graceful and beautiful work of art, which remained the pride and glory of Mechlin till the French Revolution, when it was transferred to Brussels, and melted down for the treasury. It was for the reception of this shrine that Andrew Creusen, Archbishop of Mechlin, erected, at his own expense, the present high altar of the Cathedral, in 1666. Its loss was, therefore, naturally regarded as a great misfortune; but, in 1823, the people again showed their generosity by subscribing for the present rich shrine, which was made at Mechlin itself, and was first used at the jubilee of 1825.

It is one of the characteristics of the Catholic Church, that those who serve her unto death are never forgotten. A part of the glory which they enjoy in heaven seems to extend to this world. Their names survive the destructive influences of time. Their memory lives. Profane heroes have their place in history, and excite their share of interest

amongst men ; but for the most part their glory comes short in some particular. Even the greatest amongst them exercise but little influence on the minds, the hearts, the conduct of the peoples that live and move at present. But the saints who worked for an immortal cause live still in the spirit which they infused into the world. Their fame is pure as the Church which they served, and lasts while she lasts. To St. Rumold, in particular, may be applied the words of Ecclesiasticus :<sup>1</sup>—"Non recedet memoria ejus et nomen ejus requiretur a generatione in generationem." So far, the words are justified in the Metropolitan See of Belgium, and they are sure to be more fully verified as time advances.

J. F. HOGAN.

## Liturgical Questions.

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE "SUFFRAGIA" OF THE OFFICE,  
AND THE PRAYER "A CUNCTIS" OF THE MASS.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—De Herdt (vol. ii., page 504) teaches that, whilst the patron or titular of a church must be commemorated by the clergy who are *strictè adscripti* to that church, the *patronus loci regni aut diocesis* is not to be commemorated in the Office *nisi adsit consuetudo*. At page 507 same vol., he says that seminary clerics are bound to commemorate the titular of the seminary church, if it be public, and otherwise to commemorate the "*patronus loci*."

"In vol. i., page 118, the same author holds that when Mass is said in an oratory which has no patron, the patron of the *city* or *place* is to be inserted at N., *if there be a custom of commemorating such patron in the office*, and, if there does not exist such a custom, that the words *ac Beato N.*, are to be omitted.

"Now a few practical questions suggest themselves on this subject with reference to priests residing in seminaries which have nothing but an oratory for the celebration of Mass.

<sup>1</sup> xxxix. 13.

"1. Are such clerics, in the case contemplated, bound to commemorate the *patronus loci*? I have not seen the decree on this point (15 Feb. 1873), referred to by De Herdt; but, I think, even in *this* case we should add the limitation put elsewhere by De Herdt on this subject *si adset consuetudo*.

"2. If such obligations exists, who is the *patronus loci* to be commemorated? Is it the patron of the country—St. Patrick, or the patron of the particular diocese, or is it the patron saint of the principal church of the parish in which the seminary is situated? Or does this also depend upon custom?

"3. *De facto*, is there such a custom in Ireland? If the priests of a diocese on their annual retreat, reciting the office *in choro* in the oratory of such seminary, commemorate the patron of the diocese in the office, is this to be interpreted as implying an obligation on the seminary clerics to always do the same; or is it not rather to be looked upon as a general *suffragium* in which all the priests present can join, as few of them, perhaps, would have the same patron or titular for their respective parish churches?

"4. If a priest *strictè adscriptus* to a church celebrates Mass in such an oratory or in a private house, is he always bound to insert at *N.* the patron or titular of the church to which he is *strictè adscriptus*? What if the private house be outside his own parish, or again if it be outside his diocese?

"A SUBSCRIBER."

1. It may be well for the sake of clearness to point out that there is not, as a rule, any necessary connection between the name to be inserted in the prayer *A cunctis* and that of the saint or mystery whose commemoration is to be made in the Divine Office. The name to be inserted in the *A cunctis* is *always* that of the titular or patron of the church in which Mass is actually celebrated; provided, of course, that the place in which Mass is celebrated is a church having a titular or patron. On the other hand, the commemoration to be made in the *Suffragia* is that of the patron or titular, not of the church in which one may happen to celebrate Mass, but of the church to which one is formally attached (*legitimè adscriptis*), whether the Office be recited in the parish in which such church is situated or outside it. But what name is to be inserted in the *A cunctis* by a priest celebrating in a private oratory or other place

having no patron or titular, and what commemoration in the *Suffragia* is to be made by one not attached to any church in the strict sense, or to a church having no patron or titular? This is our correspondent's first question.

With regard to the *Suffragia*, we are of opinion that priests and clerics, such as the question contemplates, are bound to commemorate *some* patron. Until recently this obligation was, as our correspondent suggests, a condition; that is, the commemoration of a patron was to be made or omitted, according as there existed or did not exist a custom of making this commemoration. But a reply of the Congregation of Rites, published in 1876, would seem, if not to impose an absolute obligation, at least to suppose the existence of such an obligation. The question proposed to the Congregation is divided into several parts. We give the part bearing on the point under discussion, together with the reply of the Congregation:—

“*Queritur.* Quodnam Suffragium faciendum est a Directoribus Seminarii sive majoris, sive minoris quibus (cui?) nulla Ecclesia publica est adnexa, a Capellanis Xenodochii, et Monialium, a Clericis in sacris, et a Sacerdotibus in majori Seminario coadunatis temporis secessus ecclesiastici?”

“*Resp.* Ad primam partem præter communia *tenentur* tantum ad suffragium patroni dioceseos vel loci.”

The question here proposed to the Congregation expressly regards persons and circumstances similar to those contemplated by our correspondent; and from the presence of the word *tenentur*, in the reply of the Congregation, we may reasonably assume that the existence of the obligation here referred to is taken for granted.

So much for the *Suffragia*. And now with regard to the name to be inserted in the *A cunctis*. Is a priest celebrating Mass in a private oratory or other place having no patron or titular, bound to insert the name of a patron? The last decision of the Congregation of Rites bearing on this point, which we have seen, is that of 1873, and it clearly states that no name is to be inserted in the *A cunctis* in these circumstances unless there be a custom of commemorating some patron in the *Suffragia*; in which case the name of



such patron is to be inserted ; but if no such custom exists, then the words *ac Beato* are to be omitted. But if we have rightly interpreted the decree of 1876, already given, it would seem to remove the conditional character of this obligations, and make it also absolute. For, if, as we contend, there is now an obligation of making the commemoration of a patron in the *Suffragia*, there can be no longer question of a mere custom. And if, when there was only a mere custom of commemoration in the *Suffragia*, there was an obligation of inserting a name in the *A cunctis*, now that custom has given place to law in the former case, the obligation in the latter must necessarily be regarded as absolute.

2. What patron is to be commemorated in the *Suffragia* ? This question, like the preceding one, it must be distinctly borne in mind, has reference only to clerics not attached (*legitime adscripti*) to a church having a patron as titular. For clerics attached to such a church are, as has been already stated, bound to commemorate in the *Suffragia* the patron or titular of their church so long as they remain attached to it, no matter in what part of the world they may be. To the question, then, we reply—either the patron of the particular diocese, or the patron of the place (*patronus loci*) in which the priest or cleric resides. This is clearly conveyed by the Congregation of Rites in the decree already quoted :—

“ . . . tenentur tantum [says the Congregation] ad suffragium patroni dioceseos vel loci.”

But which of these patrons is the one to select ? This question is not so easy to decide. We would say, however, that where a custom exists of commemorating either one or other, that custom should be maintained. Where no custom, or only a doubtful one exists, then we are of opinion that the preference should be given to the patron most closely connected with the diocese or place. From this it would follow that the patron of a diocese in Ireland should be preferred to St. Patrick.

From what has been said in reply to the first question, it follows that the name to be invested in the *A cunctis* when Mass is celebrated in a church or chapel, or other place having

no patron or titular, is that of the patron who is commemorated in the *Suffragia* by those priests of that place who are not attached to a church having a patron or titular.

3. We think there could be no stronger evidence of the existence of a custom than that mentioned by our correspondent. Of course it is for the purpose of securing uniformity. When the Office is recited *in choro*, that one common commemoration is fixed upon. But the selection of this commemoration is not made at random, but according to some principle. And this principle manifestly is, that throughout the diocese priests whose churches have no patron or titular are accustomed to make this commemoration in the *Suffragia*.

4. The fourth question hardly requires a reply after what has been already said in replying to the first and second questions. The name of the patron of a church *qua talis* is never to be inserted in the prayer *A cunctis*, unless when Mass is celebrated in the church itself of which he is patron. Hence, when a priest attached to a church having a patron or titular, says Mass anywhere else than in that church, he is not to mention the name of such patron or titular in the *A cunctis*, but is to be guided in selecting the name by the general rules we have already laid down.

#### SHOULD THE CELEBRANT TAKE HOLY WATER WHEN ENTERING THE CHURCH ?

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be so kind as to insert in the next number of the I. E. RECORD an answer to the following question :—‘ Must the server of a Low Mass present holy water to the celebrant at the door of the church ? ’

“ ENQUIRER.”

Our correspondent's question admits of a very simple reply. It is purely a matter of convenience whether the celebrant is to take holy water or not. If there is a holy-water font, as there ought to be, at the entrance to the church from the sacristy, and if the celebrant can safely remove his right hand from the burse on the chalice, then

he *may* sprinkle himself with holy water. We say *may*, because there is no trace of an obligation in the decree regarding this matter, which is given later on. But, if the celebrant is to use holy water at all, he may certainly receive it from the Mass-server. In a Low Mass the acolyte occupies the place of the Sacred Ministers in a Solemn Mass, and all writers agree that the celebrant of a Solemn Mass should receive holy water from the deacon when entering the church from the sacristy.<sup>1</sup> The decree referred to above is contained in the reply of the Congregation of Rites to the following question:—

“An Sacerdos pergens ad celebrandum, et calicem e manu sinistra portans, possit ad januam Sacristiae accipere aquam benedictam, eaque se signare?”

The reply itself is as follows:—

“*Si commode fieri potest, se signet, sin minus (id est, si commode fieri nequit) se abstineat.*”<sup>2</sup>

D. O'LOAN.

## Correspondence.

MOST REV. DR. BUTLER, ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL, AND SOME  
RECENT CRITICISMS UPON HIM.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—You will allow me space for a few remarks on Father Coleman's articles on Dr. Burke of Ossory, just completed in the I. E. RECORD. He makes allusions in them to Dr. James Butler, which I feel bound to notice and correct.

“The charity which Father Coleman shows in making ingenious explanations and suppositions where Dr. Burke's credit is concerned, he is entirely unable to extend to Dr. Butler and his friends.

“For instance, he is quite sure<sup>3</sup> that Dr. Butler's application to the Archbishop of Dublin for dimissorial letters and an *creat* had

<sup>1</sup> See De Herdt, *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, tom. 1, n. 306.

27 Martii, 1779. Gardellini, 4244, 14.

<sup>2</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 834; September, 1892.

its origin in ill-feeling towards his own Bishop. A little more care in examining the facts would have shown him that, whilst the division of parishes—the supposed cause of ill-feeling—took place in 1761,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Butler actually applied to, and obtained dimissorials from Dr. Burke in 1764, and only made application to Dr. Fitzsimon in 1765. Besides, if the origin of the application were ill-feeling, how could Dr. Fitzsimon have granted the dimissorials and promised the *exeat*? He surely satisfied himself that Dr. Butler, having been born in Dublin, might be considered his own subject: unless, indeed, he be another Irish Archbishop of the period whom Father Coleman finds wanting in proper professional knowledge.<sup>2</sup> This would be more charitable, and not more inaccurate, than to consider him as a sustainer of Dr. Butler in ill-feeling towards his Bishop.

“Similarly, Father Coleman accuses Alban Butler of stating a deliberate falsehood to the Nuncio. Whereas, again, could he not have more charitably supposed that Alban Butler wished to convey that his friend was for four years in Holy Orders, only did not know Latin enough to put the statement as plainly as Father Coleman would wish?

“Again, he might have said in favour of Father Molloy,<sup>4</sup> that he had enjoyed the parish in question for some considerable time; that Dr. Burke’s first claim of it was founded on an invalid collation; and that Dr. Burke soon found Father Molloy to be so zealous and devoted a priest that he selected him to be Dean of his diocese.

“It is not only Father Coleman’s charity which I am forced to consider limited; his accuracy in recording facts, and his cogency in argument, leave much to be desired.

“He is very indignant,<sup>5</sup> for example, that Dr. Butler was concerned in organizing a league at Ballyragget, to defend the town and his brother’s mansion against a threatened attack; and he bases his indignation on the assertion that the league was an unnecessary provocation, as a military force was present to protect the place. The fact is, that there was no military force in the town at the time of or before the attack, and the town was saved

<sup>1</sup> *Transactions of Ossory Arch. Soc.*, i. 109.

<sup>2</sup> *I. E. RECORD*, page 1617; November, 1892.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, page 714; August, 1892.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, page 1012; November, 1892.



by the bravery of the people alone.<sup>1</sup> It was only after the attack that the military were stationed there.

“Father Coleman contends<sup>2</sup> that James III., or the Old Pretender, enjoyed no real right of nomination to any Irish sees, and is very ingenious in weaving fancies around his contention. A reference to the *Bullarium Pontificium S. Cong. de Prop. Fide* would have saved him this trouble. In vol. iv. he will find briefs addressed to James III., and dated as late as 1760, which positively stated that the right of nomination did belong to James, was exercised by him, and that the persons nominated by him were on that very title appointed.

“Father Coleman seems to consider that to declare a bishop to have been nominated by the Pretender, is to deny or doubt his fitness and merits ; and that to retain a feeling of gratitude towards the nominator, must be considered unworthy of the nominee. May I assure him, that I have not held or insinuated these opinions either in general or concerning Dr. Burke in particular. And if Dr. Burke did feel a difficulty about abjuring the Stuarts claims, I can quite respect his feeling whilst I consider that a prominent parade of his loyalty may have been for certain reasons imprudent.

“But in the opinion of Father Coleman<sup>4</sup> there is nothing in the least rash or imprudent in Dr. Burke’s publications. The assertion is not quite so wonderful as the reason on which it seems to rest. The *Hibernia Dominicana* is so confused, he says, that no one can possibly find anything in it he is anxiously looking for. The only way to find anything is by searching particularly for something else. Hence, of course, the barren result of Father Coleman’s anxious search for imprudent statements. He does not appear to have tried the other method, which is indeed a pity. It is for the same reason, I presume, he denies the existence of any comment<sup>4</sup> on the Nuncio’s letter in Dr. Burke’s Supplement. And yet it is there, and was found by the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne—who however, probably was not looking for it—and was used by him in 1786, to prove that the Irish Bishops were perjurers and hypocrites, all except the honest and plain-spoken Bishop of Ossory.

“When Father Coleman is so unhandy in using the *Hibernia Dominicana*, little wonder that he completely perverts Dr. Butler’s

<sup>1</sup> See *Transactions of Ossory Arch. Soc.*, quoted.

<sup>2</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 708; August, 1892.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, page 716; August, 1892.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, page 1011; November, 1892.

*Justification.* He says<sup>1</sup> that Dr. Butler in it accuses Dr. Burke of remissness in dealing with the Whiteboys. The very slightest attention ought to have shown him that Dr. Butler is referring to the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne and the Whiteboy riots of 1786, and not at all to Dr. Burke and his time. Father Coleman's proof of Dr. Burke's activity in calming the riots of 1775, which no one had denied, is the testimony of a work published in 1767 ! But this is a matter of small consequence when compared with his account of Dr. Butler's main argument and object in his pamphlet. This was to show that the Irish Bishops were not perjurers and false to their religion, as the Bishop of Cloyne had said ; but that, in subscribing the declaration of 1774, they were quite true to the teaching of their Church, and were admitted to be so by the Holy See itself, which, he says distinctly, does not contend for the claims asserted by Dr. Burke.<sup>2</sup> And yet, in face of this, Father Coleman declares<sup>3</sup> that Dr. Butler, abandoning his natural defence, that the Nuncio (why not add Dr. Burke), in condemning the oath, did not of necessity commit himself to any of the doctrinal points enumerated, tries hard to prove that these doctrinal points were allowed by the Holy See to be the tenets of his religion. On the contrary, Dr. Butler, passing over the Nuncio and Dr. Burke as well, adopts that natural defence, and shows that the Holy See was not committed to these points, and did not include them amongst its teachings. To prove how perfectly exact Dr. Butler was in his contention, I shall quote a sentence from an official letter addressed to the Irish Metropolitans in June, 1791, by the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. It is quoted by the Archbishop of Dublin in a noted pastoral instruction published by him in 1793.

“ A most accurate discrimination,” says the Cardinal, “ should be made between the genuine rights of the Apostolical See, and those which are imputed to it by innovators of this age for the purpose of calumniating. The See of Rome never taught that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox ; that an oath to kings separated from Catholic communion can be violated ; that it is lawful for the Roman Pontiff to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We too consider an attempt or design against the life

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 1011 ; November, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Justification*, &c., page 89.

<sup>3</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 1021 ; November, 1892.

of kings and princes, even under the pretext of religion, as a horrid and detestable crime.'

"Dr. Butler, I fear, never saw this letter; he was dying, or dead, when it reached Ireland; but it is a most unequivocal assertion and sanction of the position taken up by him from the beginning. Perhaps Father Coleman had not seen this document, though it is published in a remarkable pamphlet by one of the most illustrious Irish members of his order. His acquaintance with the facts and documents relating to that period, and to the declaration of 1774, does indeed appear very limited; and this is perhaps why his assertions are so sweeping.

It is his view<sup>1</sup> that that declaration is almost identical with, is in no essential different from, another condemned by Paul V., as containing many things contrary to faith and salvation. Dr. Burke, in his modest letter to Rome asking for the condemnation of the Munster Bishops, urged the same point, and was told in answer by Cardinal Castelli that there was the widest difference between them; one being suspected (so he puts it) *de puritate fidei*, the other subject to no such suspicion. The argument was tolerable in Dr. Burke, who had not seen the entire Irish Church adopt the declaration. Used by Father Coleman, who should know the historical fact, it implies that the Irish Church, including even some Dominican prelates, born defenders of the faith and Holy See, has fallen away from the pure faith. And as there is no evidence that it has ever recognised and risen from that condition, Father Coleman, who alone has done so, will be about the only true believer in these regions. The *reductio ad absurdum* may please him, but will be a new proof to others of the value of his contentions.

"It is hardly necessary to allude to his statement,<sup>1</sup> that the position into which Dr. Butler dragged the Irish Church was false and untenable. What a pity Father Coleman does not show us how and when the Irish Church emerged from that position! At this juncture Dr. Burke is called away to his reward, and there the question remains. Can it be possible that Father Coleman is reluctant to narrate how Dr. Troy, a Dominican, specially selected to uphold Dr. Burke's position and principles was hardly settled in Ireland before he was convinced of the propriety of abandoning the one and the other, and of entering

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 1013; November, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, page 1021; November, 1892.

into the sincerest friendship and alliance with Dr. Butler; how Dr. Carpenter of Dublin speedily followed him, and how in a short time Dr. Butler's position was the position of the whole Irish Church; <sup>1</sup> a position approved and asserted, as I have just shown, by Roman authority? But, apart from this, would anyone who had the honour of the Irish Church at heart, who believed in its constant devotion to the true faith and the Apostolic See, would any such person think, much less assert, that any power could have dragged it into a false and untenable position in matters which concerned its faith and loyalty to the Holy See? The person who makes such an accusation against his Church in order to exalt a member of his Order, is disloyal to Church and Order.

"It is unnecessary to pursue Father Coleman's inaccuracies any further, though I have, indeed, touched but very few of them. Dr. Burke's admirers will regret that he has not remained longer undefended; his repute would not have suffered by the delay, if it placed his advocacy in more temperate and careful hands.

"You will permit me to add one circumstance regarding Dr. Butler. It refers to the omission of a clause in the episcopal consecration oath about which we heard so much in a late public controversy.<sup>2</sup> I claim for Dr. Butler the credit of securing that omission. The Protestant Bishop of Cloyne accused Catholics, in 1786, of merely awaiting an opportunity to become relentless persecutors; the obligation undertaken by their Bishops 'haereticos, schismaticos, &c., pro posse persequar et impugnabo,' was quoted as the proof of the assertion. Whilst Dr. Butler, in answer, explained that the pursuit and attack referred to were to be by the spiritual weapons of the Gospel, and gave many reasons to show the accuracy of his interpretation, he, no doubt, felt that the words would still retain their fearful significance in Protestant minds. And so at a meeting of the four Archbishops in Dublin, he succeeded in having a joint letter addressed to the Pope, which, at the same time, declared their inviolable attachment to their canonical obligations and to the Holy See, and suggested some such declaration concerning the episcopal oath and the words mentioned in particular as would remove the alarm and prejudice entertained. The Cardinal Prefect, after expressing his

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 315; April, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> Arising out of the conferring of the pallium on the Archbishop of Westminster.



surprise that any uneasiness could exist after the explanations given by 'your most excellent brother and Apostolic fellow-labourer, the Archbishop of Cashel, and other strenuous defenders of the rights of the Holy See,' announced that Pius VI. had even granted more than was requested in sanctioning the entire omission of the clause.

"No wonder that Dr. Renehan, though not at all partial to Dr. Butler, closes his account of him with these remarkable words: 'It is rare to find in the annals of the Church a bishop of his years gaining at once so much influence, and using it so discreetly in such difficult circumstances.'

"Believe me,

"Your very obedient Servant,

"THOMAS R. POWER."

## Documents.

### MIXED MARRIAGES IN MALTA.

Die 12 Ianuarii 1890.

Ex Aud. SSmi.

Ad dirimendas quaecumque controversias circa validatem matrimoniorum, quae in insula Melitensi contrahuntur, Sanctissimus Dnus Noster Leo divina Providentia Papa XIII, referente me infrascripto Secretari S. Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis extraordinariis praepositae, haec quae sequuntur pro Apostolico suo munere statuit decernenda.

1. Matrimonia inita vel ineunda ab iis omnibus qui catholicam profitentur religionem, sive quod uterque contrahens sit catholicus sive quod alter sit catholicus, alter heterodoxus, valida non esse, nisi celebrata fuerint iuxta formam a S. Concilio Tridentino praescriptam in *C. 1 Tametsi Sess. 24 de Reform. Matr.*

2. Eos vero qui diversum a catholico cultum profitentur, valide contrahere posse matrimonium inter se etiamsi formam Concilii Tridentini non servant, dummodo ceteroquin aliud non

obstet canonicum dirimens impedimentum. Contrariis quibuscunque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae a Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die mense et anno praedictis.

DOMINICUS ARCH. THESSALONICENSIS, *Secretarius*.

Per informazione generale S. E. Revma. Mons. Vescovo ordina che sia distribuito a tutti e singoli i Parrochi il seguente Decreto emanato dalla Congregazione del S. Ufficio.

Beatissimo Padre,

L'Arcivescovo Vescovo di Malta umilmente espone alla Santità Vostra che col Decreto del 12 Gennaio 1890 sono stati dichiarati validi i matrimoni, che saranno d'ora innanzi celebrati nell'Isola di Malta da acattolici tra di loro senza forma prescritta dal Sacrosanto Concilio di Trento.

Siccome nessuna esenzione esplicita si è fatta nel lodato Decreto di quelli già contratti, l'Oratore a togliere qualunque dubbio, e provvedere a tanti matrimoni senza quella forma sino a quella data celebrati, supplica la Santità Vostra a degnarsi dichiarare anche questi come validi.

Feria V loco IV. die 2 Iunii 1892.

In Congregatione Genli. S. R. et Universalis Inquisitionis habita coram Emis. ac Rmis. DD. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei Generalibus Inquisitoribus, proposita suprascripta instantia r. p. d. Archiepiscopi Episcopi Meliten. ac praehabito voto DD. Consultorum, iidem Emi. ac Rmi DD. decreverunt: "Attenta petitione r. p. d. Archiepiscopi Episcopi Meliten. supplicandum SSmo ut declaret et decernat matrimonia haereticorum inter se, non servata Tridentini forma. in Insula Meliten. hactenus contracta pro validis habenda esse, dummodo aliud non obstiterit canonicum impedimentum.

Feria VI. die 3 Iunii 1892.

Facta de his relatione SSmo D. N. D. Leoni PP. XIII in audientia r. p. d. Adessori S. O. inperitita, Santitas Sua benigne annuere dignata est pro gratia iuxta Eimorum Patrum suffragia.

J. MANCINI S. R. et U. I. Not.

Dalla Gran Curia Vescovile Valleta 18 Giugno 1892.

January 12, 1860.

DECREE REGARDING THE PROCESS OF CANONIZATION OF  
JESUIT MARTYRS.

DECRETUM

INDIARUM SEU GOANA

BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII VENERABILIIUM  
SERVORUM DEI RODULPHI AQUAVIVAE, ALPHONSI PACECO,  
ANTONII FRANCISCI, PETRI BERNO, SACERDOTUM ET FRANCISCI  
ARANEA, TEMPORALIS COADIUTORIS E SOCIETATE IESU, AB  
IDOLORUM CULTORIBUS PRO FIDE CATHOLICA INTERFECTORUM.

SUPER DUBIO

AN, STANTE APPROBATIONE MARTYRII EIUSQUE CAUSAE, ITA  
CONSTET DE MIRACULIS SEU SIGNIS MARTYRIUM IPSUM  
ILLUSTRANTIBUS, UT PROCEDI POSSIT AD ULTERIORA?

Innumerabiles inter Martyres, quorum exemplis fidei et fortitudinis, pretiosis tamquam lapidibus, Sponsae Christi corona exornatur, VV. Dei famuli Rodolphus Aquaviva, Alphonsus Paceco, Antonius Francisci, Petrus Berno, Franciscus Aranea sodales e Societate Iesu refulgent. Cum enim saeculo labente sextodecimo Coculini prope Goam uni veroque Deo templum, quo facilius idolatrae converterentur, excitare studerent, seditione ab idolorum sacerdotibus commota, lanceis transverberantur, ense iugulantur, telis confodiuntur, membratim caeduntur. At ipsi, *Agnum secuti*, ut praedicat Augustinus *leonem vicerunt*; fortes nimirum in fide ac divinae gratiae munere roborati, eam retulerunt nobilissimam victoriam, qua christiani heroes celebrantur, omnia perpassi cum gaudio tormenta mortis, ut suo purpurati sanguine regnarent cum Christo. Fama istius Martyrii late diffusa est, ac felrec. Benedictus XIV, iuridicis expensis probationibus, XIII calendas septembris anno MDCCXLI de ipso Martyrio eiusque Causa constare edixit. Sanctissimus autem Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII, decreto lato XII calendas martias vertentis anni, benigne indulsit, ut Dubium quod supererat de Miraculis seu Signis Martyrium ipsum confirmantibus, discuti posset in unico Sacrae Rituum Congregationis ordinario Coetu, cum voto quoque Praesulum Officialium, quemadmodum in simili causa Martyrum Iaponensium a fel. rec. Pio IX concessum fuerat. Hisce igitur Comitibus pridie calendas augusti huius anni ad Vaticanas aedes congregatis, Rmus Cardinalis Camillus Mazzella Causae Relator Dubium proposuit: “*An stante approbatione Martyrii eiusque Causae, ita constet de Miraculis seu signis Martyrium ipsum*

*illustrantibus, ut procedi possit ad ulteriora ?*" et Patres Cardinales ac Officiales Presules singuli sententias protulere suas. Attamen Sanctitas Sua, audita per Rmum Cardinalem Caietanum Aloisi-Masella Sacrae Ritum Congregationi Praefectum de omnibus relatione, esti assertorum Signorum veritatem cognoverit, suum tamen solemne iudicium pronunciare in aliam diem distulit.

Hac vero Dominica, qua Patrocinium Dei Genitricis, Martyrum Reginae, recolitur simulque a Sodalibus Societatis Iesu festum agitur Sancti Stanislai Koscae, quocum Ven. Rodolphus Aquaviva religiosae vitae tyrocinium peregit Sanctissimus Dominus Noster, post Sacrum peractum, hanc nobiliorem Vaticani aulam adiit, et pontificio solio assidens, accersiri iussit praefatos Rmos Cardinales Caietanum Aloisi-Masella et Camillum Mazzella, una cum R. P. Augustino Caprara Sanctae Fedei Promotore, meque infrascripto Secretario, iisque praesentibus solemni decreto sancivit: "*Ita constare de pluribus Signis horum VI. Dei Servorum Martyrium illustrantibus, ut procedi possit ad ulteriora, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*"

Atque hoc decretum publici iuris fieri, et in Acta S. R. C. referri mandavit idibus novembris anno MDCCCXCII.

L. ✙ S.

Card. ALOISI-MASELLA, R. S. C. Praefectus.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI, S. R. C. Secretarius.

## DECREE REGARDING THE PROCESS OF CANONIZATION OF DOMINICAN MARTYRS.

### SINARUM

BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII VENERABILIVM SERVORVM DEI PETRI MARTYRIS SANZ, EPISCOPI MAURICASTREN. ET VICARII APOSTOLICI PROVINCIAE FO-KIEN IN REGNO SINARUM; FRANCISI SERRANO, ELECTI EPISCOPI TIPASITANI ET VICARII APOSTOLICI EIUSDEM PROVINCIAE FO-KIEN, IOACHIMI ROYO, IOANNIS ALCOBER ET FRANCISCI DIAZ. SACERDOTIVM MISSIONARIORVM EX ORDINE PRAEDICATORVM AB IDOLATRIS SINENSIBVS, IN ODIUM CHRISTIANAE RELIGIONIS INTERFECTORVM.

### SUPER DUBIO

AN, STANTE APPROBATIONE MARTYRII EIUSQUE CAUSAE, ITA CONSTET DE MIRACULIS SEU SIGNIS MARTYRIUM IPSUM ILLUSTRANTIBVS, VT PROCEDI POSSIT AD VLTIORA?

Heroica Martyrum gesta, ab Augustino *spectacula Christiana* nuncupata, quibus illustrior quotidie floret Ecclesia Christi, in



VV. Dei Servis Petro Martyre Sanz, Francisco Serrano, Ioachimo Royo, Ioanne Alcober et Francisco Diax ex Ordine Praedicatorum mirabiliter renovata superiore saeculo eluxerunt. In odium enim christianae fidei, ad quam per multos Sinenses adduxerant, vincula, ludibria, verbera experti sunt ac demum primus capite plexus, alii vel horrende praefocati, vel fune ad collum suspensi. Haec inter immania tormenta, sicut aurum obryzum emicuerunt; ea siquidem fortissimi Christi pugiles non solum aequo constantique animo, sed etiam cum exultatione toleraverunt, ac ipsam mortem exitu devicerunt glorioso. Quorum de Martyrio eiusque Causa constare fel. rec. Pius VI, rite expensis probationibus, decrevit VI idus iunii anno MDCCCLXXVII. Dubium discutiendum supererat de Miraculis seu Signis hoc Martyrium confirmantibus, illudque proponi posse in unico Ordinario Coetu Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, cum voto etiam omnium Praesulum Officialium, decreto XII calendas martias vertentis anni Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII benigne induisit, sicut fel. rec. Pius IX in simili Martyrum Iaponensium Causa concesserat. Huiusmodi Congregatio in aedibus Vaticanis pridie calendas augusti huius anni coacta est, ubi per Rituum Cardinalem Thomam Zigliara Causae Relatorem, proposito Dubio: "*An stante approbatione Martyrii eiusque Causae, ita constet de Miraculis seu Signis Martyrium ipsum illustrantibus ut procedi possit ad ulteriora?*" tum Patres Cardinales, tum Praesules Officiales sua protulere suffragia. Sanctitas autem Sua, post auditam a Rmo Cardinali Caietano Aloisi-Masella Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto de omnibus relationem, assertorum Signorum veritate perspecta, supremam suam de iisdem sententiam alia die solemniter proferre statuit.

Hodierna vero Dominica Patrocinio Deiparae Virginis, Martyrum Reginae, sacra, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster, incruento Sacrificio oblato, ad hanc nobiliorem Vaticani aulam accedens, ac pontificio solio assidens, ad se accivit praefatos Rmos Cardinales Caietanum Aloisi-Masella et Thomam Zigliara, una cum R. P. Augustino Caprara Sanctae Fidei Promotore, meque infrascripto Secretario, iisque abstantibus solemniter decrevit: "*Ita constare de pluribus Signis horum VV. Dei Servorum Martyrium illustrantibus et confirmantibus, ut procedi possit ad ulteriora, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*"

Decretum hoc in vulgus edi, et in Acta Sacrae Rituum Congregationis referri mandavit idibus novembris anno MDCCCXII.

C. Card. ALOISI-MASELLA, S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI, S. R. C. Secret.

## Notices of Books.

---

ST. PAUL LES MISSIONS. By the Abbé Fouard. Paris :  
Lecoffre.

WE can do no more than announce here this beautiful volume on the missions of St. Paul by the Abbé Fouard, already well known for his *Life of our Lord*, and his work on *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity*. The Abbé Fouard is one of the ablest, the safest, the most solid, and at the same time the most delightful of Christian writers in France. His *Life of our Lord* is likely, in our opinion, to have a much more lasting fame in France than that of Père Didon, of the Abbé Le Camus, or of any of the other writers who have attempted the same sublime subject. There is a steadiness, a solidity, and a literary finish about it which none of the others can lay claim to. In his work on St. Peter, also, it would be impossible, we think, to present so much useful information in a more agreeable and varied style.

In the *Missions of St. Paul* the same method is pursued as in the other works. The developments of the doctrine by the great Apostle are accompanied by descriptions of the localities which the author has visited in person, and which are made to live before us almost as vividly as if we saw them ourselves. Nothing could be more perfect, for instance, than the author's description of Athens and Corinth when St. Paul appeared there. We can only hope that Mr. Griffith, who has so well translated the former works of the distinguished writer, may be induced to undertake this one also.

J. F. H.

ALL HALLOWS' MANUAL. New Edition, carefully revised  
and augmented. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

It is quite unnecessary to explain to our clerical readers the nature and excellence of the *All Hallows' Manual*. It has been for many years the prayer-book which the ecclesiastical students of our many colleges have turned over, day after day, during their academic course, and which most of them have clung to in their after-life on the Mission, placing it on their *prie-dieu* side by side with the breviary.

The *Manual* is, as they well know, much more than a prayer-book, for it contains, in addition to the ordinary exercises of devotion, an exposition of their spiritual duties from day to day, and week to week, and month to month; and the exposition is in a simple style, which makes an impression and leads to conviction, such as do not always attend on more elaborate treatment.

There are few of us who do not feel an attachment for the book we used with such diligence and profit as students. The daily use of it keeps us in touch with the life of peace and piety and youthful fervour of those happy days, and becomes a notable help to earnestness in our spiritual duties, by reminding us of what we were then, and what we might be now, by a faithful adherence to the practices of our college days.

The new edition is much improved. Some popular prayers in English are added, a form of the Stations of the Cross is introduced, the article on the Rosary is re-constructed, and various indulgenced prayers are inserted; but the chief improvement is in the short meditations which are better adapted to daily use and are given in English.

We should add that a shorter and simpler form of the Method of Meditation is substituted for the complicated exposition which formed part of former editions.

**SOCIALISM EXPOSED AND REFUTED.** By the Rev. Victor Cathrein, S.J. Translated from the German by the Rev. James Conway, S.J., Woodstock. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THIS work has already been translated into French, Italian, Polish, and Flemish. It now makes its appearance in English. It is a useful compendium of the socialistic doctrine, and of the chief arguments by which it is refuted. It explains what the Socialists hold on the rights of man, the theory of value, the law of wages, the organization and distribution of labour, the division of produce, the place of the arts and sciences in society properly constituted, the rights of education and instruction, the standard of economy, the laws of marriage, the rights of the State and of the family, of companies, syndicates, associations, &c. The chief arguments against the errors of the system, are very pointedly and succinctly summarized. It gives ready answers to many current fallacies, and contains a great deal of information in a very small space.

J. F. H.

ENCYKLOPÄDIE UND METHODOLOGIE DER THEOLOGIE. By Dr. Heinrich Kihn, Professor of Theology at the University of Würzburg. Freiburg : Herder.

At the present time many objections are advanced against Christianity and the teaching of the Church which represent themselves as the *conclusions of modern science*, whereas, in reality, they are as old as the Gnostics and as Julian the Apostate. In this work we are shown how many of them are refurnished to suit the modern taste, and we are supplied besides with most useful references as to where these theories are to be found in their ancient form, and where they are refuted by Catholic theologians and Biblical writers. Dr. Kihn goes over the whole ground of Biblical criticisms, errors in dogmatic, moral, liturgical, and historical subjects, and supplies the reader with a very useful repertorium of authorities who defend Christianity and Catholic doctrines against the prevailing errors, whether old or new. For anyone who can read German, it is a useful work.

J. F. H.

AI SLINGE MEIC CONGLINNE: THE VISION OF MACCONGLINNE. A Middle-Irish Wonder Tale. Edited by Kuno Meyer. London : David Nutt. 7s. 6d.

THE year just completed has seen a good many Gaelic publications. In Scottish Gaelic we have the *Eileanach*, and new editions of Campbell's tales, and of *Clarsach an Doire*, as well as several minor publications to which the Gaelic movement in Scotland has given an impetus. As to Irish Gaelic, much of our old literature has appeared in the *Révue Celtique*, and there are, besides, the Todd publications of Dr. MacCarthy and Father Hogan, S.J., while modern Irish literature has been enriched by O'Flaherty's *Siamsa*, and Dr. Hyde's *Songs of the Bards of Connaught*.

The volume now under notice is different in many respects from most Irish books. Externally it is a fine handsome book, brought out with all the care and finish we are accustomed to associate with the well-known antiquarian firm which publishes it. Internally it is furnished with notes, indices, and literary introductions.

*The Vision*, now edited for the first time, is quite unique among Irish writings. Beauty of thought, of imagery, and of style, are characteristics of all our ancient literature, but in *The*



*Vision* is added an element of frolicsome fun and whimsical drollery, altogether foreign to the serious and matter-of-fact spirit of the old Irish literature. If we look for an explanation of this, we shall find it in the circumstances in which the writer was placed.

Anier MacConglinne was born some time in the twelfth century, and as he had a taste for literary pursuits, was first intended for the Church. But his roving and unsettled spirit unfitted him for the serious duties of a preacher or recluse, and feeling the spirit moving him, he, "on a Saturday evening exactly, where he was then studying," made up his mind to become a bard. "Many were his lays," says the old poet Oengus.

But no petty laureate, fettered to a provincial king, would Anier be, but rather a literary free lance, an Irish gleeman, or troubadour, and thus he is unique among Irish writers, and his book among Irish writings.

*The Vision* contains an account, written in true gleeman's fashion, of his rambles through Munster, on his way to the king's court. He fell foul of the monks of Cork, and these, the natural enemies of the vagrant gleeman, he abuses and reviles in unmeasured terms. Subsequently he reaches the court of King Coathal, and by many strange devices cures the king of a curious and annoying malady.

*The Vision* is written in prose, with snatches of verse, as in most of our ancient literature. In a short notice it is impossible to touch on the many peculiarities of phrase and metre which strike the reader, or to profit by the many side-lights which *The Vision* throws on social life in mediæval Ireland. As the editor says :— "It is a mine where the folk-lorist and the student of mediæval institutions may find much precious material." The name of Dr. Kuno Meyer is a sufficient guarantee that the work of the editor is well done.

E. O. G.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

FEBRUARY, 1893.

---

## IS THERE A " LIMBUS PAGANORUM " ?

WE can scarcely find a better illustration of the mercy of God to all, and at the same time of the special privileges that He reserves to His elect, than in the lot assigned in the world to come to unbaptized infants, as compared with that of those who have been washed in the saving waters of baptism. The former, indeed, are clad in the white robe of spotless innocence, as far as any personal ill-doing is concerned, and God gives to them in virtue of their innocence a life of joy unmixed with sorrow, where to all eternity they will bask in the natural light that is spread abroad by the Sun of Justice wherever the taint of actual sin does not cast the dark shadow of guilt and suffering. But they are at the same time aliens and strangers to the heritage of grace; they are shut out for ever from the immediate presence of their King; they will never see Him in all the splendour of His divine beauty; they will never listen to the entrancing songs of the angels; they will never shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father, nor follow the Lamb whithersoever He shall go. Their happiness is to the happiness of those who have been washed in the blood of Christ, and sanctified by the indwelling Spirit, as a little lump of brass compared with a shining mass of gloriously-wrought gold. The privileges that will be bestowed on the children of grace will eclipse the gifts granted to the unbaptized, as the light of the noon-day sun eclipses the light of some tiny candle.

But we must not reckon among those who are thus without any fault of their own deprived of their rightful heritage, all of those on whom the water of baptism has not been poured. Beside the baptism of water, there are two other kinds of baptism—the baptism of blood, and the baptism of desire. The baptism of blood may be shared even by those who have not yet attained to the age of reason. The Church proclaims the Holy Innocents, by reason of their baptism of blood, the flowers of the noble army of martyrs and the first-fruits to God and the Lamb. In persecuting times, whether in Rome or in Japan, China or Africa, we read of little infants who were slain for Christ with their Christian parents. All such, we cannot doubt, were straightway admitted to the celestial paradise. Whether God gave to each and all of these the use of reason before the time, so that they were to accept the suffering of their martyrdom, and thus to win the crown by their own personal merits, we know not. If we may judge from the accounts that we read of little ones who showed no sign of reluctance or of fear, but offered themselves to the executioner's sword with a ready acceptance of their doom, we may suppose that God gave them the happiness of sacrificing their lives of their own accord for the faith of Jesus Christ. The third kind of baptism, that of desire, is the one that specially concerns us in the case of the heathen world. For it is, speaking generally, the only kind of baptism that is possible for them. If it is out of their reach, then the only alternative that remains for them is that they are to be assigned to the eternal fires of hell, if they have deliberately and seriously transgressed the natural law written in the hearts of all men; and if they have not, that they should share the natural happiness of unbaptized infants in the *limbus infantum* which is to be set apart for natural innocence in the world to come.

This last alternative is the one that is adopted by some modern writers. They assert that among the children who will share the natural happiness of the little ones, are a vast number of pagans of every age and condition, who have led what we generally term good lives, and who are, therefore,

undeserving of eternal punishment, though the absence of any supernatural virtue in them renders it impossible that they should be admitted into the kingdom of heaven. In this class some include not merely savages and others whose intellectual development is so imperfect as to give them no greater ability to discern the malice of sin than is possessed by a little child who has not yet reached the age of reason, but also those who were men of culture and of genius, who conformed in all substantial matters to the law of nature, as far as they were conscious of its binding force, but yet never received the grace of divine faith, and consequently never performed any action by which they could merit grace and heaven.

The question we have to consider is whether any such class exists. Have we any arguments founded either on reason, or Holy Scripture, or the teaching of the Church, from which we may determine whether there is what we may call the *limbus paganorum*, in which virtuous heathens, who never had the gift of faith, will enjoy natural happiness to all eternity, according to their deserts? Or, are we to suppose that every adult heathen is either, through God's grace and his own correspondence to it, an heir of the kingdom of heaven; or else, if he has rejected it, a prisoner through his own fault in the eternal torments of hell?

When the light of reason is sufficiently developed to render him who possesses it able to distinguish fully between right and wrong,<sup>1</sup> so far as it is made known by the law of nature, there arises at once an obligation to observe the precepts of that law. This obligation is enforced by the voice of conscience, which by proclaiming the existence of a law, virtually proclaims the existence of a lawgiver concurrently with the consciousness of this binding code: the existence of a lawgiver, who has a right to enforce it, grows up in another way. The sense of dependence which is inherent in human nature leads us instinctively and

<sup>1</sup> It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that by the age of reason I do not mean the age at which a well-instructed Catholic child is capable of committing grievous sin. In an uninstructed pagan the development of reason, and the consequent power to recognise God, may be postponed to a much later period.



irresistibly to the recognition of a Being on whom we depend, but who Himself depends on none. The knowledge that we gain of creatures suggests to us that they must have had a creator. In one or other of these ways, generally through a combination of several of them, there grows up in the mind the notion of a Supreme Being of some kind or other. The notion may be, and often is, a vague, indistinct, ill-defined one; but in all who have the use of reason there it is substantially the same, though with the widest accidental differences. The substantial identity consists in the supremacy of the Being thus conceived of, His right to our obedience, and His power of punishing after life is over our disobedience to His law, and of rewarding obedience to it—a power which reason tells us He will most certainly exercise. The law thus written on the heart is what is known as the natural law, which enjoins certain duties to ourselves, our neighbours, and to the Supreme Being who is its author. As regards ourselves, we are conscious of a law that enjoins temperance, purity, and patience; as regards others, charity, justice, and truth; and as regards God, submission, reverence, obedience, and worship or adoration. This is the stock-in-trade with which everyone starts, heathen or Christian, who deserves the name of a rational being.

Now, of these various obligations, which is the first that presents itself—I do not say necessarily in the order of time, but in the logical order? It certainly is the recognition of the lawgiver who has established the law. Even where it is not the first obligation in the order of time that explicitly presents itself, it is nevertheless implicitly contained in recognition of the law. It is impossible to keep the law without acknowledging the lawgiver, since one of the precepts of the law is that due homage, obedience, and reverence should be paid to the lawgiver. St. Thomas teaches us in several passages, that soon after attaining to the age of reason every man is bound to turn to God (*se convertere ad Deum*). Subsequent theologians have discussed what is the meaning of this turning to God. "It cannot mean," says Suarez,<sup>1</sup> "the loving God above all things; for this is certainly an

<sup>1</sup> *De Peccatis Disp.*, ii., sec. viii.

obligation which does not present itself to the child who attains to the age of reason before all others; or, indeed, for a long time to come, in most instances, since it is of all obligations one of the most difficult. It requires a knowledge of God that can only be acquired after a long time and training. Nor, again, does it mean a general resolution to follow what he knows to be right, and avoid whatever he regards as disgraceful and wrong. For such a resolution requires that he should look forward to the future, whereas the young dwell in the present, and occupy themselves with particulars. It may mean," continues Suarez, "that where an important choice between right and wrong presents itself, he is bound to choose aright; but this cannot be the meaning of St. Thomas, since this is a general obligation, and cannot possibly be identified with the *conversio ad Deum*, which is the object of the special duty of which the saint is speaking."

What, then, is the meaning of the "turning to God" which is thus put forward as necessary to everyone who attains the age of reason, if he is to avoid mortal sin? The phrase is a sufficiently vague one, and it was probably the intention of St. Thomas to leave it so. The *conversio ad Deum* would take different forms in different men, according to their knowledge, character, and ability. But there are two elements that must be present, explicitly or implicitly, whatever were the variations which, in other respects, might be present in it.

The Vatican Council, following the plain teaching of Holy Scripture and the unanimous consent of the doctors and theologians of the Church, teaches that the one and true God, our Creator and Lord, can certainly be known by the natural light of human reason, through those things that are made, and strikes with its anathema anyone who denies this. The Books of Wisdom, in the Old Testament, and the Epistle of St. Paul, in the New, lay down as inexcusable all who do not believe in one personal, supreme, spiritual Being. (Rom. i. 20, Sap. xiii. 1 *seqq.*) Hence, the recognition of God by everyone who has attained the age of reason, is an obligation, which, although it is not actually forced upon

him by the light within, is, nevertheless, so clearly manifested as one that it is incumbent on him to fulfil, that nothing but wilful blindness can hinder him from fulfilling it. This is the first element that must be present in the *conversio ad Deum* enforced by St. Thomas. The young man or woman must acknowledge some sort of Supreme Being, who has created the world and now rules over it, and over all the beings it contains. If from a dislike of the thought of God, and an aversion from Him, the youth or maiden refuse to accept the fact of His existence, such an one sins deliberately against the light, and takes his part among the enemies of God.

But this is not enough. He must not rest satisfied with the bare assent to the existence and sovereignty of the Deity. He must go further, and also make a practical recognition of his subjection to, and dependence on, the Being whom he has thus set before his face as his Creator and Lord. He must place himself in his due relation to Him; his attitude must be that of the servant to his master; of the loyal subject to his king. He must place himself in a position of subjection to Him, and his sense of dependence in prayer will naturally find expression. Prayer is an instinct of the human heart, recognising its own shortcomings, and continual dependence, and the power to help of the All-powerful King of Heaven.

This, then, we may fairly conclude, is the *conversio ad Deum* to which St. Thomas alludes. It is but a repetition of the words of St. Paul, that "He that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is the rewarder of those that seek Him." It includes a recognition of God's existence, of His dominion over us, of His office as our future Judge, and of our duty of submitting to Him, and showing our dependence upon Him by obedience to His law. All this is incumbent on man as a natural duty, belonging to the natural order. He who fulfils his duty, complies with the dictates of the natural law; and he who deliberately and wilfully fails in any of these requirements, sins against the natural law that is written in his heart. But what is the result of the obedience and disobedience respectively?

By the light of natural reason he has arrived at a knowledge, more or less distinct, of a Supreme Being, to whom he owes unconditional submission and obedience, and that under the severest sanctions. As soon as he has this fact before him, he is conscious that it carries with it some practical recognition of his own relation to this Supreme Being. There are, however, obstacles in the way. There is a reluctance on his part to sacrifice the perfect freedom of action which he craves after, and to deny himself various forms of indulgence attractive to his lower nature. There is in general, an unpleasant sense of being in many ways hampered by the claims of the Supreme Being, whose right to demand has presented itself to his understanding with irrefragable evidence in its favour, and his will rebels against the practical consequence that follows, if he acknowledges his obligation. He is conscious within himself of a certain power to accept or reject the claims of this Master, who demands his service, and he hesitates whether to allow them or not. At this moment he becomes aware of an impelling force within him, which promotes the cause of the Unseen Being, who has already spoken to him through the voice of his natural reason. This impelling force does not constrain him, but assists him to make the act of submission that is demanded of him. He is conscious of its presence, and of its being an influence that comes from above, and one the rejection of which will add to his responsibility, if he refuses the submission required of him. The new influence proclaims itself to be divine, and carries its own witness with it. It declares itself to be the voice of God, who not only asserts therein His own existence, but also declares the law, which is written on the human heart, to be a law which carries with it His personal authority; so that He who deliberately and seriously infringes its precepts, thereby declares himself a wilful rebel against His personal sovereignty and dominion, and liable to all the pains and penalties incurred by one who cuts himself off from the Sovereign Good, his own King and Lord.

In other words, supernatural grace is present to all who, having attained to the age of reason, come face to face with



the obligation of acknowledging the existence of God, and of obeying the natural law written on their hearts ; and this not only by way of the addition of a greater power to the authority of precepts recognised before, but by a higher and nobler impulse, differing in kind, and postulating the presence to the soul of a voice that says:—"It is I, the Supreme and Infinite God, who am proclaiming to you My own existence, My paramount claims on your homage, and the irrefragable authority of the law written on your conscience."

Such is the history of that *conversio ad Deum* which, St. Thomas tells us is incumbent on everyone who attains the age of reason. We can now easily understand what will be the infallible result of obedience and of disobedience. God presents Himself to man, and there is a momentary hesitation ; then the grace of God comes to ratify and to facilitate obedience. The choice that was before so difficult as to seem almost impossible, is rendered far easier, and the rejection of it becomes far more wilful and far less excusable. He who resists the grace becomes conscious that he is constituting himself the enemy of God ; and he who accepts it, and conforms to the will of God, becomes united to Him by the bond of supernatural charity. "If the man in that first trial turns himself to God," says St. Thomas, "he is justified ; if not, he sins mortally."

Now this process of which we are speaking is limited to those who have not received the grace of baptism. The baptized are already in the supernatural order ; they are already the friends of God, and the grace of God is ever with them. They have the gift of faith already infused into them, and the habit of charity ; they have no need to turn to God after the same manner as the unbaptized ; they have only to avail themselves of the graces at their disposal. It is the heathen world, on whom lies the duty of thus turning to God at some time after the age of reason is attained—it is they who on that critical occasion, from being aliens and strangers, neither the friend of God, nor in any true sense His enemies, place themselves in one or the other camp—that of God, or that of Satan.

But does this supernatural grace come to all without exception? Most probably not. Some there are to whom there has presented itself the obligation of observing the natural law (without any explicit revelation by Almighty God of Himself), as the first serious occasion of making a deliberate choice between good and evil. With the obligation were granted the natural graces enabling the will to accept the good and reject the evil. There was the grace which enforced the duty imposed by the law of nature, and there was also the *gratia medicinalis* necessary to remedy the weakness and corruption that original sin has introduced into the nature of fallen man. If the voice that sounded within was listened to and obeyed, then fresh graces followed; the first step taken in the right direction made subsequent efforts easier, and before long the supernatural Revelation, in which God revealed Himself to the soul, supervened on the previous graces, and the door was opened of the covenant of grace. But if, as was too often the case, the early natural graces were set at nought, and the law of nature was deliberately and seriously violated, then there fell upon the soul the darkness which is the result of mortal sin, and it depends simply on the will of Almighty God whether to such an one there was afterwards vouchsafed any supernatural revelation of Himself. The sinful act had cut off the man from any claim to the heritage of grace; for, though a sin against the precepts of the natural law was far less grievous than one committed against the supernatural light of God revealing Himself explicitly to the soul, yet in the voice of nature commanding with authority, there was a sufficient manifestation of the claims of a personal God to render him who violated the law a rebel against the All-powerful Law-giver. In this way many of the heathen may incur the punishment of hell without ever attaining to the supernatural knowledge of God; and as their suffering in the world to come will be comparatively light (though in itself grievous enough), yet it may be that God in His mercy spared them the opportunity of a more overt act of rebellion, and of a far heavier sentence in the world to come.

The reader who has followed my argument will perceive

how the Catholic doctrine that I have been laying down solves the difficulty respecting the future lot of unbaptized adults. The baptism of water was denied them, but the baptism of desire is within the reach of all; nay, is obligatory on all under pain of mortal sin. For the process of *conversio ad Deum*, of which I have been speaking, includes a firm resolution to fulfil all the precepts of the Divine Legislator, so far as they are known. Among these precepts is that which commands that all should be washed in the cleansing waters of baptism, if they are to see the face of God in heaven; and the necessary act of submission to God, which is the cause of justification, involves an obedience to this as to every other precept. But I think we shall be able more fully to realise the truth of this doctrine of St. Thomas, if we examine what are the consequences of the alternative theory: that it is possible for one brought up in paganism to live a virtuous and blameless life without ever attaining to the supernatural order, or being a partaker in the supernatural grace of God. This, indeed, is a theory that is advocated by some moderns. It is true, that among the unbaptized infants there may be many boys and girls, and perhaps even some young men and women who, though they are infants no longer, have had the happy privilege of avoiding any serious sin up to the time of their early death. They have never fully realised the necessity of that recognition of God, that submission to Him, of which I have spoken. They never wilfully rejected supernatural grace, and refused to obey. But we may class such among those who had not so fully attained to the full use of reason, as to belong to the number of adults properly so called. In like manner, there may be some who are adults as far as age is concerned, but who by reason of feeble mental faculties and imperfect intellectual development have not the full responsibility of the fully-developed man. But if we limit ourselves to those who, intellectually and morally, have arrived at their full stature, and consequently have all the capabilities and all the responsibilities of rational beings, it seems to me that we cannot assign to them any other lot than that of the happiness of those who have died in the grace of God, or the

misery of those who have died in a state of enmity to Him. A recent writer, it is true, tells us that Dante depicts Virgil and other pagan worthies in a state of natural happiness, and "that such a belief must have, therefore, been not uncommon in earlier times."<sup>1</sup> But when we turn to the pages of the poet we find that he, on the contrary, places Virgil and other pagans who of sin were blameless, in the first circle of hell, where they are represented as continually sighing with grief, though they suffer no actual tortures. The words of Dante are these:—

" Here as my ear could note, no plaint was heard  
Except of sighs, that made the eternal air  
Tremble, not caused by tortures, but from grief  
Felt by those multitudes, many and vast,  
Of men, women, and infants. Then to me  
The gentle guide: ' Inquir'st thou not what spirits  
Are these which thou beholdest? Ere thou pass  
Further, I would thou know, that these  
Of sin were blameless, and if aught they merited,  
It profits not, since baptism was not theirs,  
The portal to thy faith. If they before the Gospel live,  
The Gospel lived, they served not God aright;  
And among such am I. For these defects,  
And for no other evil, we are lost;  
Only so far afflicted, that we live,  
Desiring without hope. Sore grief assailed  
My heart at hearing this, for well I knew  
Suspended in that Limbo many a soul of mighty worth.' "<sup>2</sup>

Dante was, indeed, no theologian; but so far as he bears witness to the belief prevalent in his time, he reflects the severer view of the lot even of unbaptized infants; and, moreover, depicts all heathen adults who were blameless of sin, not as this writer tells us, in a state of natural happiness, but of unceasing sorrow and lamentation.

But we must return to the theory which we are discussing, and which is said to be maintained by Balmez, though I believe he limits it to those whose state of intellectual development is of the lowest. The theory is, that virtuous

<sup>1</sup> Mivart, *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1892, page 905.

<sup>2</sup> Cary's *Dante*, Canto iv., 25-42.



heathens, who have never committed any serious sin, enjoy natural happiness and union with God. They are not in heaven, nor are they in the hell of the damned, who are suffering the penalty of actual sin, but in the peaceful happy land where unbaptized infants will bask in the sunlight of unceasing joy and delight in the natural order. Can such a theory be maintained? In order to answer this question, we must first ascertain whether it is possible for a pagan, who has not the supernatural grace of God in his soul, to keep himself free from mortal sin all his life through. If he can, then we may allow that the *limbus paganorum* is, at least, a possible state of existence; if not, then it is necessary to assign to all either a place in heaven, gained through a faithful correspondence to the grace given, or a place in hell, the punishment of deliberate unfaithfulness to the supernatural grace of God.

Can a man, without the special grace of God, do good works in the natural order?—Yes, he can, and the assertion that all works done without the grace of God, are sins, is a heretical opinion, condemned by the Church. Can he resist any temptation to sin, without the grace of God, and by his own natural powers?—Yes, he can, one and another, if the force of the temptation is not very great, or if there is some strong natural motive to the contrary. Can he overcome, without grace, any temptation, however strong, that may present itself to him?—He can, indeed, do so in this sense, that it is not absolutely impossible; but there are temptations that assail us with such an overwhelming force, that it is morally impossible for him to resist them simply by his own unassisted strength. Can he, during all his life long, resist all the temptations that may befall him?—This, too, is not absolutely impossible; but it is practically impossible. For, if a man is morally unable to resist a single temptation of more than usual violence, much more is he morally unable to resist all the temptations that befall him in the course of years. Resistance is still morally, not absolutely impossible, and it is worth while to understand clearly what the difference between absolute and moral impossibility is. A thing is absolutely impossible that can be effected by no

power in heaven or on earth. Thus, it is absolutely impossible to undo the past. It is absolutely impossible that two contradictory propositions should be true at one and the same time. It is absolutely impossible that a man should, at the same moment, be the friend and the enemy of God. But moral impossibility only means that the difficulty in the way of some fact, or the improbability of its being true, is such as to be absolutely overwhelming. Thus, it is morally impossible for any ordinary man to avoid all venial sin and all imperfections for any considerable space of time; it is morally impossible that if anyone should throw out on the floor a great heap of letters of the alphabet, *pêle-mêle*, they should, by mere chance, arrange themselves in the order of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, or of the first chapter of Genesis. Moral impossibility, therefore, simply means that the chances against a thing are simply overwhelming. In this sense, then, it is impossible that any child of Adam should pass through life, and resist all the temptations that come in his way, from the world, the devil, and the flesh.

How do we know this to be the case? From the words of St. Paul (Rom. vii. 23, 24): "I see another law," where the law of his mind is the natural law written on the heart, and the law of sin is that concupiscence which is so strong in our fallen nature. The same doctrine is laid down by several of the Councils of the Church. Thus the second Council of Carthage condemns the Pelagians for saying that free-will without the grace of God can fulfil the law, whether it be the law written on the heart, *i. e.*, the natural law, or the written law.<sup>1</sup> So the second Council of Milevis anathematizes those who say that though it is no easy matter, yet we can keep the law of God, even if grace to do so be not given us.<sup>2</sup> This doctrine too derives from the daily practice of the faithful the strongest support; for they pray every day to God to lead them not into temptation, and to preserve them from sins not only against the positive, but also against the natural law. And if for those who live

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Carth. II. ep. syn. ad Innoc. I., apud St. Aug. ep. 90 (al. 175).

<sup>2</sup> Labbe, vol. ii., page 1539.

under the law of grace this prayer for continual help is necessary, how much more for those who live in a state of privation of all those aids and sources of strength which we gain from the covenant of grace. And if we look to our own personal experience, is it not true that we find ourselves surrounded with temptations so difficult to overcome, that we tremble continually lest they should be too strong for us? And are we not conscious that if the supernatural grace of God were to be withdrawn from us in the moment of temptation, so that no actual strength were granted us from above, no clearer light than that of nature to see the hideousness of sin and the beauty of virtue, should we not, one and all, find ourselves within no long interval of time a prey to the devil, or the world, or the flesh? <sup>1</sup>

This doctrine is so well-established that some theologians have regarded it as of faith; it is, at all events, theologically certain. No one ever has, or ever can, avoid all serious offences against the natural law—unless, indeed, God should in one or two extraordinary cases, preserve him from any serious temptation. We have no possible reason for supposing that any such cases exist; and we therefore assert, without hesitation, that there are no pagans who have grown up to their full age without either accepting the supernatural grace of God offered to them, and so passing into the happy condition of friendship with God and union with Him in the bonds of supernatural charity, or else rejecting it, and so rendering themselves the enemies of God, and forfeiting the heritage of grace that was within their reach. To sum up:—

1. There is no pagan of adult age who has not had a full opportunity of making a supernatural act, by which he becomes the friend of God, and receives what we may call the baptism of desire, reconciling him to God, and constituting him an heir of the kingdom of heaven.

2. There are many pagans who through their own fault fail of attaining the offer of supernatural grace, by reason of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Suarez (*De Gratia*, t. 27), whom I have followed throughout this question

their previous wilful sins against the natural law, and rejection of those natural graces by which its obligations were enforced and made easy.

3. Every pagan who has done what in him lies to keep the natural law, will certainly receive the grace to rise to something higher: "*Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam.*"

4. The case of a pagan who has lived a virtuous life in the natural order, without ever having been raised to the supernatural, is almost an imaginary one. Such an one would have a battle to fight in which defeat would be morally certain, and therefore God never exposes any to it; but, as we have seen, lays upon all an obligation of turning themselves to Him, which is the door by which they find easy entrance to the kingdom of grace, if they avail themselves of the means that God puts in their way.

5. Hence there is probably no *limbus paganorum*, nor will any adult pagans be found in the *limbus infantum*, unless they were so imperfectly developed as to be intellectually on a par with the infants.

6. Every pagan, therefore, who is lost, will be lost through his own fault. His punishment may be light, compared with the punishment of those who have lived under the bright light and amid the many privileges of the Gospel. But in itself it will not be light, inasmuch as he has rebelled, and often many times over, against Him whom he knew full well to be his Creator and Lord, and to have paramount and unlimited claims to His obedience and submission.

R. F. CLARKE, S.J.



## THE PLANET JUPITER.

WHEN seen near the meridian, about midnight, in a cloudless sky, the planet Jupiter is always a conspicuous object. Its position in October last was particularly favourable for observation ; and, although it has increased its distance from the Earth by nearly sixty million miles since then, even now, three months after opposition, the ever-varying configuration of its satellites, when viewed through a good telescope, furnishes the earnest student of astronomy with an inexhaustible store of intellectual enjoyment. Crossing the meridian about two hours after sunset, at the beginning of the new year, it gradually approached, and, later on, began to recede slowly westward from the ruddy orb of Mars—another interesting object, easily recognised in the fading evening twilight for several months past.

In following from week to week the path of any of the greater planets, as traced out on the background of the stars, one cannot help admiring the ingenuity shown by the ancient astronomers in their efforts to explain the complicated motions of these mysterious wanderers of the skies. At the beginning of December, and for four months previous, the direction of Jupiter's motion, as seen from the Earth, was westward, or, in the language of astronomers, *retrograde*; but, since then, the planet has been moving towards the east, its change of position in relation to Mars during the last week of January being only the result of a much quicker eastward movement of the latter. This perpetually recurring backward and forward motion of the planets among the stars was the enigma of the ancient astronomers ; and, in spite of many self-imposed restrictions, they solved it with singular skill.

The circle being, with them, the only admissible figure, and the Earth stationary, Jupiter was conceived as moving in the circumference of a small circle, whose centre was carried in the same order in the circumference of another and much larger one, having the Earth somewhere within it.

To distinguish them, the large circle was called a *deferent*; the smaller one, an *epicycle*; and each planet had a pair of its own. The curve in space which the planet described was made, in this way, to consist of a connected series of loops; and its motion, although always in the same order, became eastward or westward, as seen from the Earth, according to its position in the loop.

To many, such a conception will appear fanciful; but, it must be remembered that while it explained the phenomena, as then known, the motion ascribed to Jupiter by the ancients differed in no essential particular from the motion which, in our own more modern theory, we assign to the Moon. And an observer on the Sun, if the Moon were visible to him, would see in the course of a single month the same backward and forward movements of our satellite which the ancient astronomers at each recurring opposition detected in Jupiter.

As the angular velocity of the Earth about the Sun is nearly twelve times that of Jupiter, and both bodies revolve in the same order, in nearly coincident planes, but at very unequal distances, it must often happen that the Earth lies between Jupiter and the Sun. In reality, *opposition*—as this arrangement of the three bodies is called—occurs at intervals not much exceeding thirteen months. For the purposes of the astronomer, however, every opposition is not equally serviceable. The orbits of Jupiter and the Earth not being circles, but ellipses of different eccentricities, having the Sun in a common focus, the planet comes nearer to us by more than forty million miles at some oppositions than at others. A favourable opposition, as is clear, can occur only when Jupiter is close to perihelion, or point of its orbit nearest the Sun; and, hence, the planet is seen at its best but once in about twelve years—the length of time it takes to complete a revolution in its orbit.

The discovery of Jupiter's satellites, in the year 1610, marks an important epoch in the history of astronomy. The telescope, invented in Holland a few years before, had made its way into most of the countries of Europe, and in the hands of Galileo, in Italy, had become an invaluable aid

in disclosing the secrets of the heavens. The phases of Venus and the moons of Jupiter were among its earliest revelations. The state of scientific opinion at the time greatly intensified the interest taken in these important discoveries. The old hypothesis of Hipparchus, better known as the System of Ptolemy, notwithstanding the pretensions of its younger rival, still held the field. Copernicus had gone to his reward in the year 1543, bequeathing to posterity in his great work, *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium*, his theory of a central Sun. The book, dedicated to the Pope, was published at the earnest request and expense of his friend and admirer, the Cardinal Archbishop of Capua. The aged priest received into his hands on his death-bed the first printed copy, but did not live to open it. During the half century which followed the death of Copernicus, his system found but few adherents. Tycho Brahe, the greatest astronomer of his time, unable to accept it, and not satisfied with the older one, constructed an hypothesis of his own. Galileo taught the Ptolemaic doctrine in his public lectures in the universities of Pisa and of Padua. In England, Bacon, regarded by some as the founder of the true scientific method, saw "in the system of Copernicus many and grave difficulties;" and considered its author to be "a man who thinks nothing of introducing fictions of any kind into nature, provided his calculations turn out well." But phenomena, inexplicable in the old hypothesis, were rapidly accumulating; and while the strong family likeness between Jupiter with its four moons and the Earth with its one, proved irresistible to only a few, the daily increasing disclosures of the telescope were making converts of many.

To appreciate the eagerness with which the satellites of Jupiter were watched for years after their discovery, one must follow them in their movements on several successive nights. A telescope of very moderate power, on a firm stand, is all that is needed for the purpose. Even a one-inch object-glass will suffice. But when a four-inch refractor is available, the spectacle presented is vastly more imposing. It may be that the first night's watch commences in

disappointment. On looking through the tube, the bright disc of the planet is distinctly seen, resembling in some respects the full moon, on a slightly reduced scale. But some of the satellites are missing. Perhaps two only are visible. For a short time on the 26th of October last, there was only one. While engaged, however, in a minute scrutiny of the planet, our young astronomer notices a slight protuberance on the upper left-hand edge of the disc. Instinctively he turns the focussing screw, only to find that he has made matters worse. The protuberance continues to increase; and, some minutes later, is seen as a well-defined circle of light, of almost microscopic dimensions, just touching the planet. A moment more, and there is a separation, as if some aerial surgeon had severed with his scalpel the troublesome excrescence from the planet's limb. It turns out to be one of the missing satellites. Only a few hours before, it was visible on the opposite side of Jupiter; and, in the interval, might have been seen, with a good instrument, crossing the planet's disc accompanied by its shadow. But, on the return journey which, in the inverting instrument employed, is westward, no amount of telescopic power will avail to make the satellite visible throughout. Part of the way, it is *occulted*, the opaque mass of Jupiter being interposed between it and the Earth; and part of the way, it is *eclipsed*.

It sometimes happens, as is known, that the Moon, in her monthly revolution about the Earth, passes through its shadow, and suffers either total or partial eclipse. For such an occurrence, the Moon must be near one of her nodes or points where her orbit meets the ecliptic. In other positions she escapes eclipse by passing a little above or a little below the shadow. The attendants of Jupiter are less fortunate. Owing to the small inclinations of their orbits to that of their primary, and the enormous size of the latter, the satellites in each revolution pass through the cone of shadow formed by the planet. One of them, indeed, sometimes escapes; but, as a rule, it is in no way better off than the rest. The periodic times of the satellites being small, eclipses are of almost daily occurrence; and, when seen for the first



time, are very startling phenomena. While looking through the telescope at the four bright, star-like bodies, three of them arranged nearly in a straight line passing through the centre of the planet's disc, one of them begins to grow faint, and soon after disappears. Not very suddenly, however. Its extinction is that of an oil-lamp which goes out through deficiency of supply, rather than that of a gas-flame. The satellite, being a body of considerable size, requires an appreciable time to get fully immersed in the shadow; and, in the case of two of them, should the disappearance take place about three months after opposition, the reappearance may be witnessed on the same side of the planet a few hours later.

It was while engaged in observing these interesting phenomena that a remarkable discrepancy was detected by Roemer between the times of the eclipses as actually seen, and the times predicted for them by calculation. His attention was directed chiefly to the first satellite, or, as then known, that nearest to Jupiter, its eclipses being the most frequent; although, unlike the third and fourth, it had the disadvantage that the beginning and the end of the same eclipse were never both visible. The tables of Cassini—a fellow-worker in the Paris Observatory—were the only ones that fairly represented the motions of the satellites. But even these—the result of many years' patient observation—were sometimes found to be several minutes astray. Roemer resolved to observe for himself; and the year 1675 was devoted to that purpose. Finding it difficult to determine the moment at which an eclipse can be said to begin or end, he selected as the interval between each pair of successive eclipses that adopted by Cassini, and calculated the times at which all the eclipses during a whole synodic period should occur, commencing with the first that was visible after opposition. Several months of careful work with the telescope showed that in every instance the satellite emerged from the shadow somewhat later than had been predicted, the accumulated difference at the end of the half-year amounting to about a quarter of an hour. The conjunction of the planet interrupted the observations for some weeks; and, on resuming,

it was found that the observed times of the eclipses differed less and less from the computed times, until, finally, on the approach of the next opposition, the two agreed as at first.

An isolated occurrence seldom leads to discovery. But here was a phenomenon of a distinctly cyclic character. It was, moreover, evidently connected in some way with the distance of Jupiter from the Earth; for, independently of hypothesis as to the motion of the Earth or Sun, it was well known, even then, that at conjunction Jupiter is much farther from the Earth than at opposition. In searching for an explanation of these perplexing results, it was a happy conjecture of Roemer, that the motion of light is progressive, or takes time to pass through space; and not instantaneous, as all before him had supposed. The value of the interval between successive eclipses, which he assumed to be invariable, in reality, owing to the way it had been arrived at by Cassini, was almost identical with a mean of all the different intervals observed during a synodic period. From opposition to conjunction, on account of the increasing distance between the Earth and Jupiter, the observed intervals exceeded this mean value by as much as the corresponding intervals from conjunction to opposition fell short of it. The eclipses, therefore, as seen through the telescope, were retarded in one case, and accelerated by an equal amount in the other. This discovery of Roemer remained unheeded for fully fifty years. It was finally rescued from oblivion by a further discovery of Bradley.

As things stood in the seventeenth century, the absence, or supposed absence, of parallax in the case of the stars, was a formidable argument against the heliocentric theory. If, it was rightly urged, the Earth at the end of six months has changed its position in space by twice the distance of the Sun, some apparent displacement must be noticeable in the positions of the stars; just as a mile's walk along the coast alters the position of a light-house at sea, or of a church-spire in a neighbouring village inland. Copernicus had anticipated the objection, by supposing that the radius of the Earth's orbit is inappreciable, compared with the distance of the nearest star. Subsequent astronomers endeavoured to meet

the difficulty more directly by searching for parallax. And it was while engaged in a search of this kind that Bradley found *aberration*.

There are two methods practised by astronomers in searching for stellar parallax. The first consists in selecting two stars which are very close to each other—one bright, the other faint. The latter, it is presumed, is at a much greater distance from the Earth; and, therefore, much less affected by parallax than the other. As both are visible in the telescope together, the angular distance between them can be measured with great precision by the micrometer; and, by taking measurements at different seasons of the year, very small changes of distance, arising from the greater parallax of one of them, can be detected.

Bradley employed a different method. As the correction for refraction is the most uncertain an astronomer has to make, and is also very small in the immediate neighbourhood of the zenith, he selected a bright star—gamma Draconis—which, in its diurnal revolution, passed close to the zenith of his observatory. By means of a zenith-sector, an instrument specially adapted to the purpose, he measured the star's meridian distance from the zenith, and, in this way, was enabled to detect very small changes in its declination. His observations, which commenced towards the close of the year 1725, soon revealed a very remarkable change in the star's position. For some months it appeared to move southwards; then it moved towards the north; then, once more, towards the south; and by the end of the following year had attained the same position as at first—the total range of its excursion being about forty seconds. But it was clear that the displacement observed could not arise from parallax; for, during the early part of December, the star appeared to move southward; whereas, owing to the Earth's position in the Ecliptic, parallax should make it move northward. Nearly two years elapsed before Bradley succeeded in finding a satisfactory explanation of this strange behaviour of the star. An accident, it seems, suggested it. While yachting on the Thames, he noticed that the vane on the mast assumed a position between the direction of the wind

and the direction of the boat's motion, changing with the ratio of the velocities of the boat and wind, but never pointing exactly in the direction of the wind, except when the boat was stationary. His mind, at the time, was filled with the hypothesis of Copernicus—still on its trial—and the long-neglected discovery of Roemer; and he saw that by a combination of both, he could easily account for the anomalous phenomena. The star being situated near the pole of the ecliptic, the light came from it in a direction almost at right angles to that in which the Earth was moving; on account of the two motions, however, it was seen always in advance of its true position, or deflected towards the direction of the Earth's motion at the time; the amount of displacement depending on the relation between the velocity of light and that of the Earth in its orbit. Subsequent observations made on other stars fully confirmed the truth of Bradley's explanation, and, at the same time, furnished the first physical proof of the Copernican theory.

In the days of Roemer, the diameter of the Earth's orbit, which represents the change of distance from opposition to conjunction between the Earth and Jupiter, was too imperfectly known to admit of an exact determination of the velocity of light, by means of the retardation produced in the eclipses of the planet's satellites. Since then, however, it has been established by two different experimental methods, that light is transmitted through space, at the enormous speed of one hundred and eighty-six thousand miles per second; and, as a star at the pole of the ecliptic is found, by observation, to be displaced from its true position at each point in its diurnal course by an arc of twenty and a-half seconds, owing to aberration, it follows, by a well-known principle in Trigonometry, that the Earth's rate of motion in its orbit is, in round numbers, the ten-thousandth part of the velocity of light, or about eighteen and a-half miles in a second. The circle which it describes in the course of a year, at this rate of motion, must, therefore, have a radius of nearly ninety-three million miles—a value of the Sun's distance from the Earth, which is in fair agreement with the results obtained by the transit of Venus and other independent methods.



At the time of their discovery, the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites had a commercial as well as a scientific importance. The problem of finding longitude, whether on land or sea, had not as yet been solved. It was known that the difference in the times of transit of the Sun or of a star across the meridians of two places, corresponded to the difference in longitude of those places, one degree of arc being the equivalent of four minutes of time. But how were the local times to be compared? There was no electric telegraph then to enable an observer at one station to indicate to the observer at the other the exact moment when the Sun's limb just touched his meridian; nor, notwithstanding the large rewards offered by the principal Governments of Europe, had the chronometer or the sextant as yet been invented. The mariner of those days entered on his perilous voyage, furnished with a compass and an astrolabe as his complete instrumental outfit; just as Columbus had crossed the Atlantic, similarly equipped, a century before. The eclipses of the satellites, it was hoped, would remove the difficulty. A signal, made at some intermediate point between two distant stations and visible from both, it was known, could be used to find their difference of time. But here was a signal, visible the same moment over an entire hemisphere of the Earth. The motion of the satellites being accurately known from long-continued observation, the times of the eclipses for the first meridian, or zero of longitudes, could be tabulated many years in advance. In practice, unfortunately, owing to the disappearance and re-appearance of the satellites being gradual, and not instantaneous, it was found that the method admitted of much less precision than was at first anticipated for it. Two experienced observers have often been found to differ by nearly a whole minute in their estimate of the moment at which an eclipse commences or ends; and on sea, with a telescope of adequate power, the motion of the vessel makes it difficult of application. The method, however, is still retained; but chiefly as a check or substitute when the chronometer and other well-known methods fail.

The discovery of a fifth satellite will be remembered

as the principal incident in connection with last year's opposition of Jupiter. From the time when Galileo first beheld the four "Medicean stars," many hundreds of telescopes had been pointed at the planet: but, down to the 9th of September last, the existence of this youngest member of the Jovian system remained a secret. Under the penetrating gaze of an American astronomer, armed with the 36-inch lens of the great Californian telescope, however, further concealment became impossible. While looking through the 57-foot tube he noticed a "needlepoint of light," a little beyond Jupiter's limb; and when the disturbing glare of the planet's rays had been sufficiently reduced by the simple expedient of slowly interposing a thin plate of smoked mica at the focus, the new satellite at once revealed itself. It is found to complete a revolution about Jupiter in a little under twelve hours: and never goes farther from the planet than about forty-eight seconds of arc, or not much more than a fortieth part of the diameter of the Sun's disc. As yet it has been seen at only two other observatories, at one of which a 26-inch refractor was employed; and since the intensity of its light does not exceed that of a thirteenth magnitude star, its close proximity to Jupiter is likely to prevent it being seen with any much smaller instrument.

In forming an estimate of the dimensions of the planet itself, astronomers are obliged to take their data from other members of the Solar System, for the parallax, even when Jupiter is nearest to us, is too small to admit of exact determination by the ordinary process. Two telescopes at opposite sides of the Earth, if pointed simultaneously to the planet would form an angle there which, in the most favourable circumstances, would not exceed a few seconds; and, considering the instrumental and other errors inseparable from such observations, this is much too small a quantity to give trustworthy results. There are only two planets, besides the Moon, whose distances from the Earth can be determined by parallactic methods. These are Mars and Venus; and the latter only at the time of transit across the Sun's disc—a phenomenon of very rare occurrence. But when the Earth's distance from either of these is known, its

distance from the Sun, as also the distances of all the others, is easily found by means of the simple empirical law, discovered by Kepler, that "the squares of the periodic times of any two of them are related to each other as the cubes of their mean distances from the Sun." By observation, Jupiter's period is found to be a little under twelve years; and its mean distance from the Sun, deduced by the above law, is a little more than five and a-fifth times that of the Earth, or about four hundred and eighty-three million miles. At an average opposition, therefore, Jupiter is three hundred and ninety million miles from the Earth.

When the distance from the Earth is known, the length in miles of a diameter of the planet is easily obtained, since the angle which a diameter of the disc subtends at the Earth can be measured. In its mean value, the linear diameter of Jupiter is found to be about eighty-six thousand miles, or nearly eleven times that of the Earth. And, as the volumes of spheres are related as the cubes of their diameters, Jupiter, therefore, is a globe nearly one thousand three hundred times larger than our own.

A striking feature in the appearance of Jupiter, when viewed through a telescope of considerable power, is the elliptical or oval shape of its outline. In this respect the planet resembles somewhat the Sun and Moon, as they are seen at rising and setting; but there is this difference, that whereas the Sun and Moon cease to be circles only when they are near the horizon, Jupiter preserves the oval shape at all altitudes. Nor is it visual deception to which the appearance is due; for when tested with the micrometer, one diameter is found to subtend an appreciably greater angle than another at right angles to it. Like the case of the Earth, the equatorial diameter exceeds the polar, but in a much higher ratio. The difference of the two in the Earth is not quite twenty seven miles; in Jupiter, it is over five thousand miles. The cause of the difference, however, in both cases, is the same.

The Earth, we know, owes its present spheroidal shape to two things—its rotation about an axis, and the fluid condition of its mass long ages ago. The form which centrifugal and gravitating forces gave to its particles then, when

they were free to move, in its present rigid condition it still retains. Jupiter has been similarly circumstanced. Within fifty years after the invention of the telescope, Cassini detected the planet's rotation by means of spots, which moved across the disc from east to west, disappeared on the western limb, and afterwards reappeared on the eastern limb as at first. Many subsequent astronomers have verified Cassini's discovery, and have determined the period of rotation to be a little under ten hours. The velocity which this implies in particles of matter near the planet's equator is very great; for the extremity of a radius nearly forty-five thousand miles in length, to complete a revolution in ten hours, must move at the rate of more than seven and a-half miles in a second of time. The centrifugal forces arising from such rapid rotation, although inadequate to counteract completely the attraction due to the planet's enormous mass, shaped it, while still a fluid, into its present spheroidal form.

Everyone has heard of the *belts* of Jupiter. These are dark-coloured bands stretching across the planet's disc, and sensibly parallel to its equator. Viewed with a four-inch achromatic, two or three are usually seen; but when the atmospheric conditions are favourable, and a high-power eye-piece is employed, several others, and many elliptically-shaped patches besides, may be distinguished. From day to day minute changes take place in them; but the general appearance, as seen in a small instrument, remains nearly the same. The brownish-red colour of the belts is heightened by contrast with bright, white bands, which separate, and here and there intersect them. That the latter are due to large cloud-masses, floating in the planet's atmosphere, is now fully established, their parallel arrangement being the result of the planet's rapid rotation. The belts are either the body of the planet itself seen through the openings, or, it may be, other clouds deeper down, and less favourably situated for reflecting the solar rays. In Alpine regions one sometimes sees at sunset over the eastern horizon, clouds brilliantly lit up by the sunlight which they send back to us others shining with a ruddy hue; and, perhaps, the purplish streaks of a mountain side barely visible between them. It



is under somewhat similar conditions that we look down through our telescopes on Jupiter.

But the spectroscope furnishes direct evidence as to some of the constituents of the planet's atmosphere. The reader, we assume, knows that sunlight is easily identified by the number and position of certain dark lines always present in its spectrum; and that these lines are due to absorption in the media through which the white rays emanating from the central body of the Sun have passed before reaching us. The atmosphere of the Sun and the atmosphere of the Earth are both traversed by the solar beams on their way to our instruments; and each of them cuts out of the continuous spectrum a number of coloured slices peculiar to itself. The well-known Fraunhofer lines, and several others besides, have their origin in the atmosphere of the Sun; but, in addition to these, there are many which are traceable to absorption by vapours always present in greater or less quantity in our own. Experiment has shown that these *telluric* lines, as they are called, arise mainly from absorption by aqueous vapour; and hence they are best seen towards sunset, owing to the large quantity of vapour in the thick atmospheric stratum through which the Sun's rays then reach us. In dry weather, when the Sun is high above the horizon, they are less numerous, and most of them only very faintly visible.

In the spectrum of Jupiter, the Fraunhofer and other dark lines produced by the Sun's atmosphere are always present—a proof, if proof were needed, that the planet shines with light, not its own, but borrowed from the Sun. There are also many others which are coincident in position with those telluric lines shown by experiment to arise from the absorption of aqueous vapour. As the latter are found in the spectrum at all altitudes, and greatly exceed the telluric lines in intensity, they can have their origin only in those vast cloud-masses suspended in the planet's atmosphere through which they passed and repassed on their journey to us from the Sun. The inference is strengthened by comparison with the spectrum of the Moon. In it the same dark lines are present as in the solar spectrum; but, unlike the case of

Jupiter, of the telluric lines, at high altitudes, there is barely a trace. The Moon's atmosphere, if it exist at all, contains no vapour of water to intensify them.

The thick covering of vapour in which Jupiter is enveloped, implies a vast expenditure of heat at the planet's surface. Every pound weight of cloud that floats above our heads required for its production as much heat as would raise the temperature of six pounds of water from the freezing to the boiling-point. The question, then, arises, Whence does Jupiter derive the heat which keeps its skies constantly filled with clouds and vapours so thick and dense that it is doubtful whether we ever succeed even with our best telescopes in getting a glimpse of its real surface? The source cannot be the Sun. For although the planet is only a little over five times more distant from the Sun than we are, still, owing to the law of inverse squares which radiation follows, the amount of solar heat received on a given area of Jupiter's surface is only a twenty-seventh part, or less than four percent. of the amount received on an equal area of the Earth. But if the total radiation which at present reaches us from the Sun were reduced in anything like the same proportion, the mantle of clouds by which we are sheltered from the scorching heat of summer, and equally protected from the biting frost of winter, would be spread as a thick stratum of ice beneath our feet. On a square mile of surface in central Africa the amount of heat annually received is only about two and a-half times greater than the amount received on an equal area in Lapland; and, yet, what a difference it makes! We must conclude, therefore, that the vaporous envelope of Jupiter is not produced by the action of the Sun. The heat-radiation of the other members of the Solar System need hardly be considered; and the stars are too distant to lend their aid. It can only be from the body of the planet itself that the heat is derived.

There was a period, we know, in our own planet's history<sup>1</sup> when the water which now covers two-thirds of its surface existed only as clouds and vapour suspended in its atmosphere. The igneous rocks which everywhere underlie

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Third Series, vol. x., n. 4 (April, 1889), page 291.

the limestone and other aqueous deposits, point clearly to a time when the Earth was a mass of molten minerals. By radiation into the cold regions of space, it gradually solidified; and when the temperature of its outer covering was sufficiently reduced, the clouds and vapour became condensed in the form of liquid on its surface. Jupiter and the Earth have had a common origin; and, in obedience to laws impressed on all matter at its creation, both are hastening through similar changes to a common destiny. Of the two, Jupiter is by birth the elder; but, owing to its greater mass, its cooling has been much slower. Its mean density, which is less than one-fourth the density of the Earth, makes it even doubtful whether any part of the planet has as yet become solid. But, as happened to the Earth ages ago, the day will come when the clouds which now conceal the planet from our view, will form vast oceans on its surface; and the astronomer of the future looking down through his giant tube will survey in silent wonder its continents and seas, as we now gaze through our large refractors on the "canals" of Mars, or the "craters" of the Moon.

To the question, often asked, Is Jupiter inhabited? the astronomer can only hazard a conjecture. Life, whether animal or vegetable, as we know it on the Earth, admits of a wide range of climatic conditions. The Alpine tourist gathers edelweiss at the very verge of the snow-line; and grain-seeds, buried for years on the mountain-top, covered with ice several feet in thickness, will germinate when transferred to the warmer soil of the valley. But, no living organism will long withstand the disintegrating action of boiling water or of burning liquid lava. And although the thermal condition of Jupiter's mass cannot be determined, even approximately, by any direct process known to science; yet, its low mean density, which differs little from that of the Sun, combined with other indications—all pointing in the same direction—would seem to show that the planet's temperature is still much too high to admit of any living thing, animal or vegetable, finding a habitation on its surface.

F. LENNON.

## HOMÆ LITURGICÆ: OR, STUDIES ON THE MISSAL

THE TEACHING OF THE MISSAL, FROM SEPTUAGESIMA TO  
EASTER.

THE learned Sulpitian, M. l'Abbé Bacquez, says, in his treatise, *Du Sacrifice Divin*, that one of the greatest helps to celebrating Holy Mass with due dispositions, is to carefully study the words of the Mass we are about to say, so as to find out the thoughts and sentiments Holy Mother Church would suggest to us by the special prayers and lessons she assigns to each day. These variable parts of the Liturgy bring vividly before us her mind—"the mind which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. ii. 5), and show us the spirit in which she would have us offer the Holy Sacrifice. We also discover in these parts that marvellous *rapproch* which the Missal has to the Breviary; and by studying the Mass we will find at the altar the remembrance of Matins and Lauds, and will carry away to the rest of our Office the sweet memory of the Mass. Many of God's saints have made a practice of studying beforehand their Mass; and we may take for an example, St. Joseph Calasanz, who even in his old age never forgot to read over-night the Mass he intended to say, and made mental mark of any special passages which shed light on the feast or season.

In order then to illustrate the advice M. l'Abbé Bacquez gives, we have ventured to lay before the readers of the I. E. RECORD some notes on the teaching of the Missal for the Sundays of the present season. We merely attempt an outline in the hope of inducing our readers to go to the Missal itself, and find out for themselves more of the abundant treasures therein contained.

The chief object Holy Church has in these nine Masses, is the instruction of the catechumens who are to receive Holy Baptism on Easter Eve, and to prepare them for the change of life she expects from them after the regeneration in the saving waters. To this end she also adds, during Lent, her public penitents, and encourages them to go on sincerely in the



way of penance. This then is the burden of all her prayers and instructions—to tell the catechumens what sin is, to fill them with a hatred thereof, and to lead them on by the thought of what sin has cost her Divine Spouse, to prepare themselves for the Sacrament of Baptism. Now that she has changed somewhat her discipline, and no longer confines the solemn administration of Baptism to Easter and Whitsun Eves, nor demands public penance, she still keeps the old formulas, for they are most appropriate to the preparation the faithful make during this holy season for fulfilling the Paschal duty.

The first three Masses are a prelude to the solemn fast, and already does Holy Church put off the festal garb, and hush the songs of joy. Christmas with all its holy thoughts is over, and the angels’ hymn no longer is sung, and with it go the *Te Deum* and *Alleluia*. She dons the purple of penitence, but does not yet lay aside “the dalmatic of justice” nor the “tunicle of joy;” for the fast has not yet begun, although the shadow of Lent has already fallen on her life.

#### SEPTUAGESIMA,

Called by the Greeks *Prophonesima*, on account of the publication they make this day of the coming fast and date of Easter. Holy Church brings before us in both Mass and Office the creation of man and his fall. The story is told in the Lessons at Matins, and the Mass is full of the thoughts that we are fallen from the end for which we were made, and that God has given us means whereby we can regain that which is lost.

The Introit is a sad picture of fallen humanity: “The wailings of death have come upon me, the sorrows of hell have fallen round about me; in my tribulation have I called upon the Lord” (Ps. xvii.). In the Collect we confess that we are “justly afflicted for our sins;” and in the Tract we call for help from “out of the depths” of our misery. Then Holy Church tells us how and where we are to seek relief. In the Introit we are made to pray, “O Lord, my strength . . . my Refuge, and my Deliverer;” in the Collect we plead for mercy, “for the glory of Thy name;” in the Gradual we

mind that God alone is "the Helper in due time," and never forsakes them that seek Him, neither forgets He "the poor one," whose patience perisheth not for ever; and therefore in the Tract we call upon Him, "Oh hear my cry, and let Thine ears be attentive to the voice of Thy servant." The Secret tells us that the heavenly Mysteries we are about to celebrate are the source of our healing; the Communion (Ps. xxx.) is a cry for mercy, more trustful now that Jesus is in our hearts, and is shedding the light of His countenance upon His servant; the Post-Communion is a prayer for perseverance.

The Epistle (1 Cor. ix.) tells us of our end for which God has made us. Our life is a race for a prize, and we must so order our days as to attain our object—the incorruptible crown of life eternal. Note the subtle distinction between the earthly crown, *corruptibilem*, and the heavenly one, *incorruptam*, never changing, always ready and waiting for us, "laid up for us," as St. Paul says, from all eternity. We are ever tending to sin, and therefore we needs must chastise our bodies lest we go astray. Note also on this the first day of the preparation of the catechumens the reference to the waters of Baptism: *Omnes in Moyse baptisati sunt in nube*; together with the sin, Holy Church tells us of the remedy. The *De profundis* of the Tract also takes our mind to the waters of Baptism, "in the depths" of which we are buried with Christ; and His saving grace is commemorated by the other words, "with Thee is there propitiation."

The Gospel (St. Matt. xx.) carries on the same thought as the Epistle. The Master of the household calls us to work for Him, and tells us that the reward depends upon our faithfulness; and He reminds us that though many are called to the perfect way and higher things of His love, yet few accept the invitation, "Friend, go up higher," but remain in their careless and slothful state; so that those that have corresponded to the call, even if it be at the last hour, shall be put first, and the others made to take the last place. What, then, is the outcome of these thoughts, but that in the words of the Offertory: "It is indeed a good thing to confess to the Lord" (Ps. xci.)?

It will be well to remember that the catechumens had

to leave the church after the instructions were over ; so we will find the remainder of the Mass, from the Offertory, to be of a mere personal nature to the priest who has instructed the others, lest while he preaches to others, he himself becomes a castaway.

## SEXAGESIMA,

Called by the Greeks *Apocreas*, because of the abstinence beginning the next day. The main thought of the Church to-day is to pray her Divine Spouse to multiply the number of His people by the catechumens who are born to Him by the work of the apostolate in the preaching of the Gospel. In the office we have the history of the deluge (a figure of Baptism), and the saving of the few found faithful in Noe's Ark (a figure of the Church) ; for He was "the preacher of justice" (2 Pet. ii. 5) to the "incredulous" who perished in the flood ; but they that hearkened to His word, "that is, eight souls, were saved by water, whereunto Baptism being of the like form, now saveth you also" (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21). The new children Holy Church hopes to receive on Easter Eve are the fruit of the preaching of justice. Now let us apply these thoughts to the Mass of this Sunday.

The Introit is a cry of distress which our race sends up to the Maker, praying for restoration to grace. "Arise, why sleepest thou, O Lord ? arise, and cast us not off, even to the end ! Why turnest Thou away Thy face ? . . . help us, and free us" (Ps. xliii.). The Collect tells us of St. Paul, who was raised up by God to "help and free us" by his apostolate ; and in the Epistle we have his own account of the manner in which he preached the Gospel, as "the minister of Christ," and as having dwelling within him also "the power of Christ." The Gradual is a prayer against the persecutors of those who are under instructions, that God would bring to nought their malice, and make their evil deeds "as stubble before the wind" (Ps. lxxxii.). The Tract contains the promise that after the trial "the elect will be set free" (Ps. lix.).

The Gospel carries on the idea of the apostolate in the parable of the Sower whose seed is the word of God. Here we have a vivid and consoling picture of the result of our preach-

ing; for although some seed may be lost, yet when it takes root an abundant harvest is garnered. We are reminded of those other words of the Holy Ghost: "Cast thy bread upon the running waters, for after a long time thou shalt find it again." (Eccl. ii.) The Offertory is a prayer for the Priest, for his perseverance: "Make safe my steps in Thy path: that my feet be not moved. Show forth Thy marvellous loving-kindness, O Thou who savest them that put their trust in Thee" (Ps. xvi.); while the Secret and Communion tells us that the Blessed Sacrament is the source of our perseverance, for therein is our youth renewed. The Post-Communion prays for the pastors who exercise the work of the apostolate, that they may be worthy to serve their Divine Master.

We may here note that in none of these Masses, nor in any of the older Masses, is any reference made in the Collect to the Sacrifice, or to the Holy Communion. And the reason is this: the unbaptized were purposely kept in ignorance of the tremendous Mysteries, for they are the Mysteries of Faith, and it was not until they were dismissed from the Church, after the Gospel, that we have any reference to the great act.

#### QUINQUAGESIMA,

Called by the Greeks *Turophagia* (for during this week milk-meats were still allowed), brings before the catechumens the important fact that we are justified by faith and good works. Holy Church selects for the example upon which to base her instruction, the holy patriarch Abraham, the "friend of God;" for, as St. James says, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works?" (2) and was not his faith of the highest order, as is seen in the sacrifice of Isaac? The keynote, then, of to-day's Mass is faith, living and bearing fruit.

The Introit sets before us man, knowing his own weakness, led on by faith to cry to God for help: "Be Thou to me a God, a Protector, and a place of refuge to save me . . . and for Thy Name's sake Thou wilt be to me a Leader, and wilt nourish me . . . in Thy justice free Thou me, and deliver me" (Ps. xxx.). In the Collect we are reminded that is it our faith which obtains the victory and freedom from the bonds of sin. The Epistle (1 Cor. xiii.) is St. Paul's



wonderful description of holy love ; and nothing could be better than this Epistle, that love with all its beautiful fruits is the quickener of faith, and that without it faith is dead. The Gradual is an act of faith : "Thou art the God who alone worketh wonders, and hath made Thy might known even among the Gentiles." (Ps. lxxvi.) This is a glad cry of Holy Church at the sight of her catechumens. The Tract teaches them to serve their Master with joy, for the man of faith has his heart widened, and runs therefore cheerfully in the way of the commandments. The Gospel (St. Luke, xviii.) gives us two pictures : one of those who, when our Lord foretold in clear and distinct terms all the incidents of His approaching Passion, "understood not the things that were said ;" and the other, of the blind man by the way-side, whose faith was so strong that our good Lord healed him, and told him it was his faith that made him whole.

The Offertory is a prayer for light to know God's law ; the Secret prays that the Blessed Sacrament may sanctify both body and soul. The Communion—"They did eat, and were filled exceedingly . . . and were not defrauded of their desires" (Ps. lxxvii.)—tells us that God's gifts to the man of faith surpasses his highest hopes ; and the Post-Communion tells us also that the Gift we have received is our defence against all our enemies ; as David said : "Thou hast prepared a table for me against the face of all them that hate me" (Ps. xxi.). We have now passed through the time of preparation, and the solemn fast has begun. The Liturgy of the time is the richest of all the Church's year, but we must confine ourselves only to the names for the Sundays, for those of the Ferial Office are but rarely said. Holy Church now joins to her catechumens the penitents, upon whom at the beginning of Lent she has cast the ashes of repentance, and whom she hopes to reconcile to their offended Maker, "on the day before He suffered." They share in her maternal solicitude, and for their sakes as well as for those awaiting Baptism, she chooses the moving histories of divine mercy towards sinners we find now in her liturgy. Bearing this in mind, we understand the spirit of sorrow and penance which pervades the solemn offices, and which silences the joyous

sound of the organ, and takes away from the ministers the festal dress of the dalmatic and tunicle. But she, tender mother that she is, is careful lest they be oversad with too much sorrow ; so we see, from time to time, the veil lifted, so as to give consolation and encouragement to those who do penance.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

The leading thought to-day is to warn us of temptation, and to point out the means of resisting. And this is well, for at the time when men seriously are thinking of entering upon the work of salvation, they are particularly open to temptation, according to the words of the Holy Ghost : " My son, when thou beginnest to serve God, prepare thy soul for temptation " (Eccles. ii.). The Introit is a promise of hope which God gives us in the struggle against flesh and blood : " He shall call upon Me, and I will hear him : I will deliver him and will glorify him . . . who dwelleth in the aid of the Most High " (Ps. xc.). The Collect prays for the success of the work we have determined upon. The Epistle (2 Cor. vi.) warns us that our life is a long combat against all manner of enemies ; but our strength " is in the Holy Ghost, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God ; " and with these weapons, although, as the world judges, we may seem to be beaten, to sorrow and to die, yet, in truth, we shall be victorious, joyful, and ever-living. The Gradual and Tract carry on the same thought as the Introit. " Our help is with God, who hath given His angels charge over us, and hath encircled us round about with His truth, as with a shield, and hath gathered us under the shelter of His wings. Though a thousand fall at our side, and ten thousand at our right hand, the evil shall not come nigh us ; for He hath said, He hath hoped in Me, and I will deliver him ; I will protect him, for he hath known My name." This is the gracious promise of this great song of hope, so full of encouragement to both catechumens and penitents.

The Holy Gospel (St. Matt. iv.) relates the temptation of our Divine Master, " thus leaving us an example." It warns us of three special sources of temptation, especially to the sinner, viz. :—Sensuality, presumption, pride and ambition.

The Offertory and Communion are the same words, but with a different meaning attached to them. The Offertory tells us of the paternal care of God, who surrounds us with His grace, wherein we can trust. The Communion takes a deeper meaning, for now we can say with St. Paul : “ I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me.” We have now the very Author and Giver of Grace within us. How strong and mighty are we now in His strength and might, and how perfect is our trust in Him ! The Secret prays that we may by fasting curb our several temptations, and the Post-Communion prays that by the power of the Blessed Sacrament we may pass to the fellowship of the saving Mysteries by being freed from the bonds of our temptations.

#### THE SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT

Keeps up the idea of encouragement in the warfare. But for the full understanding of this most beautiful Mass, we must bear in mind the ordinations that took place the previous day. The Introit is full of confidence, based on the eternal mercies of God : “ Remember, O Lord, Thy tender mercies and Thy loving-kindnesses which are of old . . . Redeem us, O Israel’s God, out of all our troubles ” (Ps. xxiv.). Note a reference to the priestly vocation : “ Thy loving-kindnesses which are of old ;” for that suggests those other words : “ With an everlasting love have I loved thee, and therefore have I drawn thee ” (Jer. xxxi.). The Collect confesses our own helplessness for well-doing, save by the help of grace, by which we shall be safeguarded and cleansed within and without. The Epistle (1 Thess. iv.) exhorts us to a godly life, for “ this is the will of God, your sanctification ;” and bids us so work as to please God, not in fleshly desires, but in holiness. One means of so doing is, “ in Christ Jesus our Lord.” How all this again tells not only for the catechumens and penitents who are about to lead a new life, but especially for the newly ordained, “ that they may abound the more,” and be holy, for their Lord is holy. The Gradual (Ps. xxvi.) is a lowly cry for help : “ See Thou my lowliness, and my labours, and forgive all my sins :” while the Tract (Ps. cv.) is a song of chastened joy. God’s mercies are for ever

(*sacerdos in æternum!*). Who can tell the power of the Lord, or make known His praises better, than those who are the objects of His gracious mercies, whether by calling them to the waters of Baptism, or to reconciliation, or, above all, to a share in His eternal priesthood?

The gospel of the transfiguration is full of the same sublime thoughts. A glimpse of the glory of heaven is given for the encouragement of those who have entered upon the new way. She also sets before them the joys that await them when they are transfigured with the brightness of Divine grace, and become co-heirs with Christ; and to show them what grace can do, she sets before them one like themselves, “taken from among them,” transfigured by the Sacrament of Orders into the glorious resemblance of the Great High Priest Himself. “It is good for us to be here” under the dispensation of grace, when we can merit such a height of glory hereafter! The Offertory tells us that love is the secret of all success in our warfare—*quæ dilecti valde*—for it is indeed the fulfilment of the Law. The Secret that our devotion may be increased by the Holy Sacrifice, for this is a great source of encouragement. The Communion (Ps. v.) gives three titles to our Maker, and so three grounds of trust, love, and obedience: “My King, my God, and my Lord.” Now that we are united to Him in the Blessed Sacrament, He is indeed our very own; but we must not forget that He is our own in order to help us to serve Him better as our Sovereign Lord. The Post-Communion is, as is generally the case, a prayer for perseverance in a holy life since we have been refreshed by the Holy Sacraments. This last prayer, again, is the thought of a newly-ordained priest who, after the recent mark of his Master’s love, would make his life a perpetual act of thanksgiving and praise.

E. L. TAUNTON.



## ALFRED TENNYSON.—II.

THE year in which "In Memoriam" was published (1850) is regarded by most writers on Tennyson as the most important of his life. It marks the culminating point as well in his fortunes as in his career. Wordsworth had died in the early part of the year, and in consequence the Laureateship had become vacant. Though no less than half-a-dozen claimants were mentioned in connection with the office—among them Samuel Rogers, "Barry Cornwall," Leigh Hunt, and Robert Browning—yet popular suffrage and royal favour were at one in conferring the dignity upon Tennyson. In November, the warrant was signed by the Lord Chamberlain, appointing him, in the quaint jargon of the court, "to have, hold, exercise, and enjoy all the profits and privileges of the office" of Poet Laureate of England.

Whatever may have been the duties of Laureate in the earlier periods of English literature, it is certain that, from the formal endowment of the office in the person of Ben Jonson, its occupant was expected to render faithful service to the court, by turning off, at stated times, verses in praise of his generous employers. Poetry thus written to order seldom has the genuine inspiration; and, in course of time, the court-poet became a "court-fibster," bound to indite, as Cowper well expresses it,

"His quit-rent ode, his pepper-corn of praise,"

on each recurring festival of royalty. Wordsworth was the first to rescue the position from this pitiable degradation, and Tennyson followed manfully in the footsteps of his gifted predecessor. Yet his Laureate poems, as already intimated, cannot be reckoned among his best. His "Welcomes" to the Princess of Wales and the Duchess of Edinburgh are insipid and commonplace; his "Odes" at the opening of the International and Colonial Exhibitions are uninspired and artificial; his "Charge of the Heavy Brigade," and "Third of February, 1852"—the latter called forth by the aggressive attitude of Louis Napoleon—though they contain some

passages of rare power and eloquence, yet might have been written by a less gifted poet. Vastly superior to these, in affectionate sympathy and loyalty of tone, are the Prologue and Epilogue to the "Idylls" and the prefatory address to the Queen. The following stanzas from the last poem have long been favourites, and may not be inaptly quoted at the present time :—

"And statesmen at her council met,  
Who knew the season when to take  
Occasion by the hand, and make  
The bounds of Freedom wider yet,  
  
By shaping some august decree  
Which kept her throne unshaken still,  
Broad-based upon her people's will,  
And compassed by the inviolate sea."

But the "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington" and "The Charge of the Light Brigade" are the noblest poems in the collection. With perhaps an unnecessary degree of complexity and much superfluous ornamentation, the "Ode" is nevertheless no unworthy tribute to the memory of the "great world-victor's victor;" and many of its lines have already sunk into the hearts of the English people. How often do we find quoted—

"Not once or twice, in our rough island-story,  
The path of duty was the way to glory!"

and—

"This is England's greatest son,  
He that gained a hundred fights,  
Nor ever lost an English gun!"

"The Charge of the Six Hundred" is so well known as to demand no comment here. There is a martial ring about its lines which recalls the fatal blunder of Balaclava more vividly than could the pen of a Macaulay or the pencil of a Turner. It is the best known of all Tennyson's poems, and will be certain to live as long as the English language itself.

Resuming the consideration of Tennyson's more important works, we next encounter a volume given to the

public in 1855, entitled "Maud, and Other Poems." The principal of the "other poems" are "The Daisy" and "The Brook"—the former, a perfect picture-gallery of Italian views in miniature; and the latter, a tender idyllic narrative in which the murmuring ripple of the streamlet breaks through the Arcadian simplicity of the story, in verse which is as perfectly onomatopœic as our language is capable of yielding. But the most elaborate composition of the volume is "Maud," which, however inconsistent with the effeminacy of the title it may appear, is nevertheless one of Tennyson's greatest poems. We feel bound, therefore, to devote to its consideration a space proportionate to its importance among the author's works.

We learn from Tennyson's conversations with Mr. Knowles, the present distinguished editor of the *Nineteenth Century*, that the poet always regarded "Maud" as one of the finest things he had written;<sup>1</sup> and yet, strange to relate, it was received on its first appearance with a storm of abuse almost unparalleled in the annals of criticism. *The Edinburgh Review*, *Blackwood's Magazine*, *The National Review*, and many of the other leading periodicals of the time, noticed it unfavourably; while not a few anonymous writers, in prose and verse, attacked its author in terms more forcible than respectful. It must be admitted, however, in explanation of these facts, that Tennyson left himself open to such treatment. From the beginning, many features of the work were likely to be misunderstood. The views expressed by the hero, a man of morbidly sensitive disposition, who ultimately becomes insane, are so worded, that many readers might easily mistake them for the author's own; and as they happened at the time to be most unpopular with a large section of Englishmen, the necessary consequence was that they met with little toleration from either the critics or the reading public. The Crimea War was absorbing the attention of Europe at the time; the united forces of England and France were sitting before Sebastopol; every post brought unwelcome news of the sufferings of the English soldiers; and the wisest political prophets could

<sup>1</sup> See *Nineteenth Century* for January, 1893, page 187.

not forecast the further developments of the struggle. England, therefore, was naturally in a condition of great excitement. As Mr. Bright eloquently expressed it, "the angel of death was abroad in the land, so that you might hear the flapping of his wings." Hence, we can easily imagine the reception accorded to a poet who, in the face of such circumstances, undertook to pronounce a panegyric on war, and to curse the blessings of peace. We are not surprised to find one of Tennyson's anonymous opponents expressing himself in the following terms :—

"Who is it clamours for war? Is it one who is ready to fight?

Is it one who will grasp the sword, and rush on the foe with a shout?

Far from it : — 'tis one of the musing mind who merely intends to write ;

He sits at home by his own snug hearth, and hears the storm howl without."<sup>1</sup>

But Tennyson's purpose was completely misunderstood by the critics referred to. In selecting such a hero for his poem, he was only following the example of Shakespeare and other dramatists, in whose works insanity in all its phases plays so prominent a part. Possibly he had also the ulterior object of pitching the tone of his work, by means of this device, on a key of acute poetic sensibility, which would enable him to give expression to sentiments for which he did not wish to become personally responsible ; yet, even in this hypothesis, it would be as unfair to censure Tennyson for the passionate ravings of his supersensitive hero, as it would be to hold Shakespeare personally responsible for the vagaries of Touchstone, the morbid philosophy of Hamlet, or the extravagance and insanity of Lear. But since false impressions had been created, the poet deemed it prudent to introduce a corrective in the second edition, by describing the work as "*Maud: a Monodrama.*" In his conversations with Mr. Knowles, he explains the reason of the alternative title. "The work," he says, "ought to be called '*Maud, or Madness.*' It is slightly akin to *Hamlet*. No other poem (a monotone, with plenty of change, and no weariness) has been made into a drama where successive phases of passion

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Arthur Waugh in his *Alfred Lord Tennyson*, page 144.



in one person take the place of successive persons.”<sup>1</sup> This furnishes a key by means of which the work, with all its complex philosophy on love, and war, and politics, and the modern resources of civilization, is at once laid open to our view.

The poem consists of three parts, which correspond respectively to the three periods of supersensitiveness, insanity, and recovered consciousness, in the life of the hero. It opens with a description of a “dreadful hollow” and a “ghastly pit,” in which the father of the speaker was found dead, the victim either of murder or suicide. There is no positive proof of murder; yet the fact that the melancholy incident was the result of an unsuccessful pecuniary speculation in which “the lord of the large estate and the Hall” was the gainer, is sufficient to engender in the hero’s mind a deep-rooted hatred of plutocrats, a contempt for the blessings of peace, a longing for the excitement and tumultuous action of war. He himself too would mix with action lest he should “wither by despair;” and hence the irresistible logic of insanity impels him to lay all the evils that afflict humanity at the door of peace:—

“Why do we prate of the blessings of peace? We have made them a curse.

Pickpockets, each hand lusting for all that is not its own;  
The lust of gain, in the spirit of Cain, is it better or worse  
Than the heart of the citizen hissing in war on his own  
hearthstone?

But these are the days of advance, the works of the men of  
mind,

When who but a fool would have faith in a tradesman’s ware  
or his words?

Is it peace or war? Civil war, as I think, and that of a kind  
The viler, as underhand, not openly bearing the sword.

. . . . .  
Peace sitting under the olive, and slurring the days gone by,  
When the poor are hovell’d and hustled together, each sex,  
like swine,  
When only the ledger lives, and when only not all men lie;  
Peace in her vineyard—yes! but a company forges the wine.”

<sup>1</sup> See *Nineteenth Century* for January, 1893, *l. c.*

The "vitriol madness" flashing up "to the ruffian's head, till the filthy bye-lane rings to the yell of the trampled wife;" the "chalk and alum and plaster" "sold to the poor for bread;" the "villainous centre-bits" grinding "on the wakeful ear in the hush of the moonless nights;" the apothecary "cheating the sick of a few last gasps, as he sits to pestle a poison'd poison behind his crimson lights;" the Mammonite mother killing "her babe for a burial fee;" and Timour Mammon grinding "a pile of children's bones:" these, and such as these, are "the blessings of peace." Contrasting them with the curses of war, the speaker demands, in a cry of passionate emotion: "Is it peace or war?" And he answers:—

"Better, war! loud war, by land and sea;  
War with a thousand battles, and shaking a hundred thrones.  
For I trust if an enemy's fleet came yonder round by the hill,  
And the rushing battle-bolt sang from the three-decker out of  
the foam,  
That the smooth-faced, snub-nosed rogue would leap from his  
counter and till,  
And strike, if he could, were it but with his cheating yard-  
wand, home."

The demand for war assumes a still more definite and not less impassioned form in the third part of the poem, when the hero, after a period of confinement in Bedlam, is represented as having recovered sanity. He rejoices at the thought that "a war should aim in defence of the right;" that "iron tyranny now should bend or cease;" that the millionaire should no longer be "Britain's one sole God":—

"For the peace, that I deemed no peace, is over and done,  
And now by the side of the Black and the Baltic deep,  
And death-grinning mouths of the fortress, flames  
The blood-red blossom of war with a heart of fire."

But these morbid clamourings for war have, after all, only a secondary purpose in the poem. They are merely designed to form a gloomy background which serves to

throw into relief the most tragic love-tale in Tennyson. Though Maud is daughter of "the lord of the broad estate and the Hall," she becomes the heroine of the monodrama. Erotic passion, jealousy of a rival, and hatred of a brother, who is a "jewelled mass of millinery, smelling of musk and insolence," are the motive springs of the plot development; while a political dinner, a duel ending fatally, subsequent flight and madness, and the tragic death of the heroine, are the chief incidents in the poem. So successfully does the author combine the materials at his disposal, that there is nothing within the whole compass of his works, viewed from the purely artistic standpoint, to compare with the exquisite music, the polished and elaborate expression, the elevated and impassioned sentiments, that unite in this celebrated work to give poetic embodiment to the design of its author. But the *I. E. RECORD* is scarcely the most suitable place for a more detailed analysis of these aspects of the poem.

There is another feature of the work, however, which we cannot afford to overlook—namely, the infinite possibilities of metrical development which it suggests. Many of the shorter odes and songs introduced into "Maud" are the most successful attempt at "music without notes" in the whole range of English poetry. Yet the metre, for the most part, is perplexing in its irregularity. It seems to follow no law save that of harmony with the poet's thought. Like Coleridge's "Christabel," it completely abandons the principle of uniform feet, and aims at isochronous lines, regardless of the number of syllables that go to constitute each; but while Coleridge, as he tells us in the preface to his poem, confines himself to four accents in each line, though the syllables may vary from seven to twelve, Tennyson claims a still greater licence; for, while observing the law of isochronism within each section of the poem, he sometimes introduces as many as sixteen syllables in a line, and sometimes as few as four. In this way Tennyson revives the old Anglo-Saxon measures unburdened by their monotonous alliteration, and with the additional charm of rhyme. His plan is a decided improvement both on the

heroic couplet, which prevailed almost exclusively from Dryden to Cowper, and on the romantic-narrative measure brought into vogue by the example of Coleridge and Scott. Not only does "Maud," therefore, enrich the English classics with exquisite poetry, but it also furnishes future writers with new principles of metrical science, and thus marks the opening of another era in the history of literature.

Admirable though this poem was from many points of view, yet its most admiring critics could not withhold the expression of their belief, that England expected from Tennyson some work of greater intellectual power than he had hitherto produced. With genius not inferior, as it seemed to many, to that of Spenser or of Milton, he should not hesitate, they assured him, to undertake some grand epic subject, and rival, in his treatment of it, these great masters of English song. The suggestion was not thrown away. Already he had dealt with the minor aspects of a theme that had always been regarded as epic in character. "The Lady of Shalott," "Sir Galahad," and "Morte d'Arthur," were only the vernal off-shoots of a legendary growth that admitted of larger development; and the poet's success in these earlier productions was a sure guarantee that he should not fail, when he would come to deal with the *Arthurian Legends* as a whole. He accordingly set about writing "The Idylls of the King." In 1859, "Enid," "Vivien," "Elaine," and "Guinevere," were published; ten years later, "The Coming of Arthur," "The Holy Grail," "Pelleas and Ettarre," and "The Passing of Arthur," appeared; "Gareth and Lynette" and "The Last Tournament," were added in 1871; and the work was concluded, in 1885, by the introduction of "Balan and Balin" into its proper place in the series. When the first poems appeared they were regarded by most readers merely as different portraits of the female character; but subsequently, when the remaining legends assumed their respective places in the collection, a unity of design became at once perceptible, and the allegorical significance of the work struck the thoughtful reader as its most beautiful and important feature.



Hence, to appreciate duly the "Idylls of the King," we must study them as a whole—first, with a view to understand the legends embodied in them, and, secondly, for the purpose of discovering the spiritual meaning they unfold.

The *Arthurian Legends*, which supplied the materials for the "Idylls," are founded on the life of an illustrious king who ruled over Cambria and Strathelyde, in the sixth century. For ages they had remained mere vague traditions; but, about the eleventh century, they assumed a literary form in certain *Welsh Tales* and French *Romances of the Round Table*, which ultimately were incorporated by Geoffrey of Monmouth in his Latin *History of the Britons*. Later on, towards the close of the fifteenth century, in a work entitled *Morte d'Arthur*, by Sir Thomas Malory, they grew into a series of popular legends; and ever since they have continued to be a great storehouse of poetic incident for the foremost masters of English song. King Arthur is the hero of Spenser's *Faërie Queene*. Milton hesitated for a considerable time before selecting *Paradise Lost* in preference to the *Arthurian Legends* as the subject of his great epic; and, even after the selection, found the literature of the Round Table a source of copious illustration in working out his theme. Dryden and his contemporary, Blackmore, dealt at length with the same subject—the one in a drama allegorizing the events of Charles the Second's reign, and the other in two elaborate poems of ten and twelve books respectively. Gray and Bulwer Lytton followed on lines not very different from those of Blackmore. But the great glory of wedding these historic legends to poetry that shall live as long as the language in which it is written, was reserved for Tennyson, whose "Idylls" are as far superior to any similar work on the subject, Spenser's alone excepted, as is the "In Memoriam" to the earlier elegiac poems with which it has been compared.

Unlike the *Morte d'Arthur* of Malory, which is little better than an antiquarian study, the "Idylls" has for its spiritual purpose to symbolize the struggle that is being waged perpetually in man's heart, between the lower and the higher

instincts of his nature. As the poet himself expresses it in the epilogue, the tales are—

“New-told, and shadowing sense at war with soul  
Rather than that gray king, whose name, a ghost,  
Streams like a cloud, man-shaped, from mountain peak,  
And cleaves to cairn and cromlech still.”

Arthur, on the morning of his marriage, taking upon him the onerous responsibilities of his kingdom, amid the clang of battle-axe and the clash of brand, while his faithful knight-hood sing,

“The king will follow Christ, and we the king  
To whom high God hath breathed a secret thing”—

is a type of the human soul in its pristine innocence and power. There is perfect union of all his forces; envy, rivalry, untoward ambition, find no place among his followers; his name is a bulwark of strength against the aggression of his foes. Not only does he refuse tribute to his enemies, but, by carrying war into their territories, he reduces them to submission, and thus builds for himself a realm, and reigns. “Gareth and Lynette” leads the parallelism a step further. To become member of the king’s knighthood, Gareth is prepared to discharge the most menial offices; and once admitted, he bears the insults of proud Lynette with patience, ever answers courteously, and marches on with confidence to perform the tasks entrusted to him by the king:—

“Say thy say, but I will do my deed.”

“Geraint and Enid,” unwarrantably cruel though many of its incidents appear, yet shadows forth spiritual perfection at its highest. It is a type of the discipline to which the soul must oblige its faculties to submit, on the least suspicion of unfaithfulness arising from their conduct. Enid, the Griselda of modern literature, submits with uncomplaining patience to the severe trials imposed upon her by her husband; and her virtue being thus proved, she is once more received into the position of confidence and authority she had forfeited for a moment. Thus do “The Coming of Arthur” and the first three “Idylls” represent the most

brilliant period of the Round Table, and typify the soul triumphant over sense.

But the noble projects of the king were foredoomed to defeat. Two great sources of weakness grew up by degrees in Arthur's court — sensuality and ill-regulated religious enthusiasm. The wiles of Vivien to win "the charm of woven paces and of waving hands" from Merlin, the magician, strike the first note of evil omen in the "Idylls." Wickedness in its most revolting form has had the effrontery to approach the spotless knighthood of the Round Table; and though most of Arthur's followers may resist its blandishments with success, it will not take its departure without leaving the seeds of evil example behind it. The success of Vivien is followed by the guilty intercourse of Launcelot and the Queen. The pure atmosphere of the court is polluted by treachery and adultery, which entail as their natural consequences the perfidy of Modred, the unbelief of Pelleas, the lust of Tristram and Isolt, and the tragic death of Elaine, who becomes a victim on the altar of an unrequited love. Side by side with these varied sources of disintegration, there appears an ill-regulated religious enthusiasm, which impels the knighthood of Arthur to undertake "the Quest of the Holy Grail." Typical of the piety which leads unwary souls to aspire to impossibilities, and which always ends in disappointment, the Quest of the Grail proved the pursuit of a fen-fire, and was punished by beholding everything crumble to dust before it. Indeed, Arthur himself had foretold the result:—

"And spake I not too truly, O my knights?  
Was I too dark a prophet when I said  
To those who went upon the Holy Quest,  
That most of these would follow wandering fires,  
Lost in the quagmire?"

And so the illustrious knighthood of the Round Table, which had been inaugurated under such promising auspices, dissolved into confusion and chaos, and finally disappeared like the shadow of a dream. As they typified the human soul in their rise, so did they also in their fall. Sensuality, on the one hand, and a disordered piety, on the other, are

the great enemies of man. If they once effect an entrance into the soul, all its glories are brought to nought : reason is flouted, sense rears the standard of rebellion, disintegration in all its forces supervenes, and its spiritual strength is gone.

But the passing of Arthur was something far different from death. As the good Sir Galahad by fire, so Arthur by sea, passed to another land ; but to return again. Excalibur, indeed, was cast away ; but, in its stead, other weapons have been supplied for the defence of the true and the just. And chief amongst these is prayer. Arthur's last words are :—

“ More things are wrought by prayer  
Than the world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice  
Rise like a fountain for me night and day ;  
For what are men better than sheep or goats,  
That nourish a blind life within the brain,  
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer  
Both for themselves and those who call them friend ?  
For so the whold round earth is every way  
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.”

Thus there is a generous catholicity of treatment in this noble work of Tennyson that goes far to atone for the narrow bigotry and blind scepticism that he has elsewhere betrayed.

The character-painting in these poems is not of the highest order. The author had two alternatives before him—either to make the historical Arthur his hero, and to give us a realistic picture of his reign, with all its ignorance and barbarism ; or, to idealize the subject by elevating it to the domain of imagination, and thus rendering its chief actors shadowy and impalpable, like the creations of mythology. The latter alternative Tennyson selected, and in doing so he manifestly adopted the wiser course. Nearly all the legends are founded on some gross violation of our modern principles of manners or of propriety. From the standpoint of common sense no less absurdity attaches to the exploits of Arthur's knights than to the chivalrous follies of Don Quixote or the heroic inanities of Hudibras. It is clear, therefore, that the poet consulted best for our modern tastes and prejudices by transferring his heroes and heroines into the regions of



fairyland, and enshrouding them in a glamour of romance which renders them, if shadowy and unreal in outline, yet beautiful and poetic in character.

This is especially the case with Arthur himself. We see him rather in the language of others than through the medium of his own actions. When he addresses his knights, there flashes from eye to eye, through all their order, "a momentary likeness of the king;" when his subjects come to ask their boons, he expresses himself in apothegms instinct with inspiration, for his kingship is in part divine, and must be used "to help the wronged through all the realm." When his knighthood return disappointed from the bootless Quest of the Holy Grail, he asserts his own dignity and superior wisdom, and the privileges he enjoys—

"In moments when he feels he cannot die,  
And knows himself no vision to himself,  
Nor the high God a vision, nor the One  
Who rose again."

These, and such as these, are the gleams of his character that are allowed to reach us. There is one scene, however, where the greatness of his personality flashes on us like a revelation. It is his final interview with the Queen in the convent of Almesbury. The whole passage is one of the noblest in Tennyson, but the space at our disposal prevents us from quoting more than a few lines. The creation of the Round Table is described as follows:—

"But I was first of all the kings who drew  
The knighthood-errant of this realm and all  
The realms together under me, their head,  
In that fair order of my Table Round,  
A glorious company, the flower of men,  
To serve as models for the mighty world,  
And be the fair beginning of a time.  
I made they lay their hands in mine, and swear  
To reverence their king as if he were their conscience,  
And their conscience as their king;  
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ;  
To ride abroad redressing human wrongs;  
To speak no slander, no, nor listen to it;  
To honour his own word, as if his God's;  
To lead sweet lives of purest chastity."

Next in interest to the King, and superior to him as a well-defined dramatic personality, is Lancelot. He stands out from the other figures with all the distinctness of a Hotspur or a Bolingbroke. The peerless knight, the dauntless soldier, the glory of the Round Table, the particular friend of the King, he looms up before us as one of the grandest creations of literature, whether as jousting in the tourney, or deliberating in the council, or conducting his followers to war. And yet the curse of the Round Table is to come from him:—

“ His honour rooted in dishonour stood,  
While faith unfaithful kept him falsely true.”

But he is not wholly evil. Twice or thrice, at least, his nobility of character finds expression. He hates his own baser nature, and would gladly free himself from its toils:—

“ But in me lived a sin  
So strange, of such a kind, that all of pure,  
Noble and knightly in me twined and clung around  
That one sin, until the wholesome flower  
And poisonous grew together, each as each,  
Not to be plucked asunder; and when my knights  
Swore, I swore with them, only in the hope  
That could I touch or see the Holy Grail,  
They might be plucked asunder.”

We have said nothing of Tennyson's delineations of female character, or of the innumerable erotic passages that occur in these poems. And yet it is when dealing with such subjects that the poet is at his best. But, for obvious reasons, we are precluded from referring to these aspects of his writings, and must confine ourselves to a notice of the more edifying portions of his works.

There remains yet another feature of these remarkable poems which we cannot afford to pass in silence—namely, the beauty and simplicity of their language. Other writers may surpass Tennyson in dramatic energy, in the power of throwing themselves into different characters, and expressing thoughts in harmony with their assumed condition; but none have ever surpassed him in the gift of saying what he has to say in the simplest, most beautiful, and most unaffected

language. Whether these poems are idyllic in incident and treatment, may be open to question; but that they are idylls in their chaste and melodious simplicity of expression, cannot be doubted for a moment. No writer since the days of Chaucer has surpassed Tennyson in this respect; and his example, at a time when there exists a general tendency to debase the purity of the language with a scientific jargon of vulgar latinity, cannot but exercise a salutary influence on the future literature of England. From this point of view alone the "Idylls of the King" are well deserving of study.

JOHN CLANCY.

(*To be continued.*)

## THE NATURE OF CATECHISTIC WORK.

ON a certain occasion a priest was asked his opinion as to what was the most important function of the sacred ministry, and his reply was, *the catechizing of the children*. He was then asked what he considered the next most important function, and he gave the same response—the catechizing of the children. It was a style of answer like to what St. Augustine said of humility, when he was asked what was the first and most important element in the Christian life; or like to the observation of the Grecian orator, who said that in eloquence *action* was the first requisite, and the second, and the third; or, again, like to the remark of Father Faber, in his *Spiritual Conferences*, where, speaking of the best method of resisting temptation, he says:—"Cheerfulness is the first thing, cheerfulness is the second, cheerfulness the third."

Now, was there any exaggeration in the reply given by this priest to his querist? We do not think there was. For we have the weightiest authorities, we have men eminent for piety, for learning, for position, plainly stating, that not merely is the catechizing of children a function not

in any degree inferior to the others of our ministry, but that it is even paramount to the rest.

The late Monsigneur Dupanloup, in his book entitled *L'Œuvre par excellence*, calls the catechizing of children "a great work, the most important of all priestly works, that which St. Paul designates the *opus ministerii*, *opus Christi*." And, again, he calls it "a work which we ought to rank highest in the Church of Jesus Christ." The celebrated Gerson, in his treatise, *De Parvulis ad Christum trahendis*, says:—"Nescio prorsus an quidquam majus esse possit quam tales parvulos quasi plantare aut rigare." And Pope Clement XI. declared that teaching the rudiments of Christian doctrine to the children was the "*præcipuum animarum rectoris munus*."

If we are to credit authorities such as these, then it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance, the excellence, the grandeur of this work, this *præcipuum animarum rectoris munus*. The other functions of the ministry are, no doubt, grand; they are sublime; their sublimity is, indeed, unspeakable; and their utility and necessity are as great as their sublimity. To preach the word of God to the people, to shed its salutary light on their believing minds, by its divine power to touch, move, transform, sanctify, save their souls; to confess those penitents who come to us in the tribunal of penance; to pour out upon them the cleansing blood of the Redeemer; to shut for them the gates of hell, to open for them the gates of heaven; afterwards to break for them the bread of life; to comfort and console them in the hour of death, and to prepare them by the last sacramental rites for the tremendous passage into eternity: these, surely, are most stupendous functions; they are functions most holy and most necessary. And what far-reaching, what eternal interests depend upon them. Yet we are told by illustrious personages, whose word none of us will venture to gainsay, that not one of all those priestly functions deserves a higher appreciation, not one of them is entitled to a more devoted and unsparing zeal—that they indeed, if possible, merit a less careful diligence on



our part—than the sublime and all-important function of catechizing the little children.

It is not our business now, or our intention, to give the reasons for the importance and sublimity of this work. What we propose to ourselves is merely to point out what this work is: what is its nature, its scope; what was the precise idea such eminent men as we have mentioned have had of it; what was the idea entertained of it by enlightened men of all times; what is the idea we ought to have of it ourselves.

In the first place, the teaching of the Catechism to the children is not merely getting them to commit to memory the answers contained in the Catechism. It means this certainly; but it means much more than this. The careful committal to memory is but the first step in this important work; it is but the beginning, the foundation of the building.

Our object, surely, in teaching the Catechism to the children is to communicate to them *knowledge*: that at the very least. If after all our classes and lessons the little ones have not a true and substantial knowledge of Christian doctrine, our teaching may be regarded as vain and fruitless. But is “committing” the answers knowledge, or does it necessarily imply knowledge? No one will say so, for clearly it may be but a mere achievement of the memory, the intellect having little or nothing to do with it. That young lad, who so glibly spins out for you all those answers with such *verbatim* exactitude may be as unconscious of the meaning of what he says as that dumb companion by his side, who is so blissfully ignorant of even the words of the Catechism as not to be able to give you any answer at all; he may be all the while only going through a kind of mechanical process, for which his memory may deserve some credit, but his intelligence none. Test him outside the Catechism; ask him the same or similar questions in words different from those he is accustomed to, and, not unlikely, he will find himself completely “at sea.” Missing the old familiar form of question, which from association easily brought the answer to his mind, he will be at a loss to know what reply

to give to you. Certainly this will be the case if his catechetical teaching has been confined to the mere mechanical process of committing the answers to memory.

But suppose the catechist has gone much farther than this; suppose he has taught the children to know the Catechism, to know it really well; he has, let us imagine, in the progress of the lessons carefully explained every sentence and every word; he has not let a single difficulty pass without entirely unravelling it; by a happy use of illustration and example, he has made even abstruse things plain to the children's minds; in short, by his skill as an instructor, he has in the course of time transformed his juvenile pupils into actual little prodigies of theological lore; even so, is the Catechism as taught in such case all it ought to be? is it Catechism, in its full, true, proper sense? is it that priestly function and work, which is claimed to be the most important, or one of the most important, duties of the ministry? No; Catechism understood aright means more than this; another element must yet be added, without which the work remains a lame, barren, unfinished thing.

The *instruction* of the children, the communicating of religious knowledge to their minds, is of supreme importance. No one doubts it; for everyone knows that *ignorance* in religious matters is fatal. But of what use, pray, is all the religious knowledge in the world without *virtue*? Ah! virtue is something better and higher than knowledge, something more necessary for the children. Knowledge is but the means, virtue is the end; knowledge is but the flower, virtue is the fruit; knowledge only brings responsibility, but virtue establishes a claim to the kingdom of God.

Now here is the third element that enters into the work of the Catechism: the children must, by means of the knowledge given them, be trained and formed to Christian virtue. That they be made to "commit" the answers in the Catechism, is necessary; that they be made to understand all the Catechism contains, is more necessary still; but what is more important than either, is that their

doctrinal training result in their being good, sincere, practical Christians. This is the crown, the fruit, the perfection of the work.

If children possessed the two faculties only, memory and understanding, then, indeed, in giving them instruction it would be sufficient to attend to these faculties alone; when you had stored the former with religious truths, and enlightened the latter with a competent knowledge of these truths, then you would have done your work; there would be no need to extend it to further limits. But children have other faculties besides memory and understanding—they have heart, they have conscience, they have will; they possess a soul with its passions, weaknesses, affections, aspirations; a soul destined for two momentous futures—an earthly one, and an eternal one. To all these things must the Catechism reach; upon every one of them must it be made to shed its benign and fructifying influence, otherwise it is not *Catechism*; it is but a faint and imperfect semblance of what Catechism ought to be. The true business of catechistic teaching is to mould and form the child; to elevate and perfect its moral nature; to awaken, rectify, and purify its conscience; to strengthen the natural infirmity of its will by inspiring it with a dread of everything that is evil, and with a love for everything that is good. In a word, the true work of Catechism is to make the child an enlightened Christian if you will, but certainly a *virtuous* one.

That this is the correct view of the Catechism, no one will think of denying. Indeed, if we study closely the relations that subsist between the priest who teaches the Catechism and his little flock who learn it, it will be seen at once that there can be no other view. Look at him and them assembled there in the church for the Christian doctrine. Do not the circumstances of the case necessarily constitute him not a mere pedagogue or teacher to these young souls, but a very saviour to them. No one knows better than he what these little children are: immortal spirits who have lately come from the bosom of the Deity, and who are destined to return thither soon again. No one

knows better the helplessness of their condition, and the many wants of their weak, untaught, inexperienced, and as yet, perhaps, innocent souls. No one knows better the life they have to face : a life full for them of the most serious dangers. And well is he aware that, unless they are duly prepared for these dangers, the bright hopes one may be inclined to entertain about them now will soon be extinguished, and they like so many other innocent victims will be swept away by the strong current of the world's iniquity. Nor can he forget his own position, his own calling in their regard. He is conscious that he is their priest, their divinely constituted teacher and guide : that it is to him and him alone the Saviour has said : " Feed these My lambs." It is impossible for him then to mistake the nature of the work he is called upon to do. As he looks out upon those children seated before him, and as they look up to him, do not those bright, earnest, confiding eyes of theirs seem to appeal to him for counsel, for advice, for help, for strength, for something to buoy them up amid the dangers of this sea of human life upon which they have entered? Does there not a cry rise up to him from every little heart in that audience ; a cry which makes itself articulate in words like these : — " Father, I am but a child, a frail, ignorant child. Oh ! there are so many things I ought to know, and I know so little. Oh ! I want some one to teach me, some one to guide my steps. You, a holy priest, and one nearer to God than anybody else, you are the person to do it for me. Oh ! do instruct me in everything that is necessary for me. Tell me all I ought to know, and all I ought to do. Tell me about God, about heaven, about eternity, about hell ; tell me about Jesus, who came down from heaven for me, and died for me. Show me how I am to love Him, and make myself dear to him. Oh ! not merely teach me those things, but deeply imprint and engrave them on my heart. Cause me to feel them, to be subdued and carried away by them ; cause me to live in accordance with them. Knowledge is not enough for me. I want something greater, something better than knowledge. I want to be what God made me to be. I want to be *good and happy* ; yes, good and happy,



nothing less. I want never to commit sin. I want to save my soul."

It cannot be said that these ideas are mere fancies. No; they spring from reality, and are justified by the circumstances of the case. There are the children's souls, naked, hungry, helpless, unprepared for what is coming. From the depths of their need and their danger, their cry rings out clear and unmistakable; and to whom but their priest and their catechist is the cry addressed?

In the school with their master or their mistress the children are, we may admit, but scholars; but at the Catechism, conducted by their priest, it is not so. There they are the little ones of Christ, the favourite ones of His flock; there they are the lambs of the fold, who come seeking those nourishing pastures, which they cannot find of themselves, but which their divinely-appointed shepherd is bound to discover for them, in accordance with the Saviour's precept: *Pasce Agnos meos*. And the catechist, on his part, what is he? He is, by no means, a mere teacher or professor; he is very much more; he is priest, he is apostle, he is educator, he is father; he is one whose duty it is to cherish, to support, to convert, to inflame: one who has for his divine calling to sanctify and save the souls of others, and *especially* the souls of children; one who should not merely point out the way to heaven to those *favoured* of the Saviour, but who should even guide and conduct them thither; "who should bear them thither in his very arms." "I affirm with persistence," says Monseigneur Dupanloup, "and with a certainty of not meeting with a possible contradiction, that the Christian catechist, really worthy of this great name, is a holy minister, invested with an august character, that he may accomplish the most beautiful work in young souls: he is a shepherd who knows the most dear sheep of the flock of Jesus Christ; who calls them by their names, who goes before them, and anxiously leads them into the pastures of eternal life; *ante eas radit*; he is a father who loves his children with tenderness; he is a mother whose pleasure it is to nourish them; fully justifying the words of Fenelon: '*Be fathers; but that is not enough, be mothers.*'"

There will be no danger of our having an erroneous or inadequate idea of catechistic work, if we keep well in view *the end* to be accomplished by it. What is that end? It is the sanctification and salvation of the souls of the children. Now, what will sanctify, what will save the children? The recitation of the Catechism will not do it. Neither will the knowledge of the Catechism, however accurate or extensive that knowledge may be. The knowledge is as we have already said, absolutely necessary. Without it the children will grow up in spiritual ignorance, and become a prey to all those evils to which such ignorance is sure to give rise. Moreover, it must be confessed that this knowledge will, of itself, tend considerably to the moral improvement of the children. To know truth is a first step taken towards its practice. Besides when religious ideas have been instilled into the mind, they will, in some measure, at all events, be likely to make an impression on the heart. This impression circumstances may afterwards deepen. That child, who has at the Catechism learned some particular truth, will afterwards on some occasion seriously reflect upon it, or his pious parent, by some moving advice or exhortation, will drive it home to his conscience, or the interior illumination of divine grace will present it to his intelligence in a forcible and striking manner. Circumstances like these, operating on the child, will cause the truth, whatever it be, that he has learned at Catechism, to penetrate to his heart; will cause the knowledge that is already in his mind to overflow into his conscience, stimulating and exciting it; and so a moral effect, a moral amelioration, will have been brought about in the child's soul. This effect, however, this amelioration, be it observed, is not due to the child's knowledge, *as such*, but springs from the fact that the truth of which he had been made conscious is presented to his mind *in such a manner and in such circumstances, as that it strikes, moves, actuates him*, penetrates to the depths of his soul.

In moral matters there are, as everybody knows, two kinds of knowledge. One is dead and barren of results, the other lives and imparts vitality and energy to the soul; one rests merely in the mind, the other penetrates to the depths

of the heart ; one is mere theory, the other shows itself in practice ; one is the letter that kills, the other is the spirit that giveth life. In catechetical teaching, the former knowledge must, of course, be imparted, for without it the latter could not exist ; but of itself, and apart from the latter, it is utterly useless in so far as the sanctification and salvation of the soul are concerned. That which converts and saves souls is not *knowing* the truth, but *feeling* it. Those children who have the best knowledge of Catechism are not always those who practice its lessons most faithfully. The very reverse is not unfrequently the case. Have we not all had experience of this ? Have we not at times met with children who knew the Catechism perfectly, who in this respect were as “ shining lights ” in the midst of their companions ; but who nevertheless were addicted to vices and evil habits, that instead of being corrected by the superior knowledge which these children possessed, rather kept pace with it ; or, perhaps, grew daily more and more inveterate in spite of it ? And, on the other hand, have we not oftentimes had experience of children, who though having but little knowledge of Christian doctrine, and little opportunity, perhaps, of acquiring it, have, notwithstanding, preserved their innocence, established themselves in virtuous habits, or, it may be, have corrected themselves of former evil courses ?

Now, why the difference between those two classes of children ? Why has truth been so inoperative in regard of the one, so very effective in regard of the other ? May not the explanation be frequently found in this fact, that in the former case the children, though they were taught much, were but little or not at all *impressed* ; while, in the latter case, though taught but little, they were brought under the power of that little, and made to *feel* it. The former children, those who morally were unaffected by their religious knowledge, had for their catechist only a lay teacher, who had no idea of the catechistic work beyond the mere recitation of the words ; with, perhaps, the most meagre explanation of some manifest difficulty now and again ; or, it may be, their catechist was a priest, whose idea did not rise very

much higher : who, from inadvertence, conceived the great end of Catechism to be nothing more than the proper *instruction* of children in the rudiments of the Christian doctrine ; and who, therefore, confined his attention, and the efforts of his zeal, to the attaining of this object alone ; forgetting, meantime, the loftier and far more essential work of seizing upon and *christianizing*, so to say, the hearts of the children. Being a good teacher, perhaps, and being in earnest at his work, he succeeded in what he wanted to accomplish : he made his pupils good scholars in religious matters ; but, from a lamentable oversight, he left out that, without which even the work he did was worth little : he forgot to make it his principal aim to mould, to form, to convert, to save the children ; he failed to employ the due methods and resources to bring about this great purpose, and so, in spite of all his teaching, and in spite of all his pupils' progress in the Catechism, they remained, in so far as morals were concerned, in the state in which they were before, or they fell to a worse condition.

On the other hand, those children who preserved their innocence, or were reformed from evil ways, had the happiness of attending a Catechism conducted by a pious and enlightened priest, who, whatever store he may have set on his pupil's instruction as such, regarded their *religious education* as of infinitely greater importance, and who, therefore, carefully seized upon every opportunity, and made use of every possible means to make salutary religious impressions upon them, and to bring them entirely under the sway of the truths that he taught to them. Not content with explaining the words of the Catechism and of giving clear and simple expositions of doctrine, he frequently addressed his little audience in strong and *moving* discourses ; he narrated to them *interesting*, and even *thrilling stories* and examples ; he painted before their young but quick imaginations *striking pictures* and scenes : he taught them how to *pray*, to practise *self-examination*, to make their *confessions*, and *communions*, to *perform acts* of the various virtues, both interior and exterior : he *exercised* them in such *practices* of piety as were suitable to their age ; he repeatedly



endeavoured to inspire them with a *love* and a *fear* of the Almighty, with a *dread of sin*, and a *desire of virtue*; in a word, by a variety of most happy methods and expedients he strove to make those young souls entirely *captive to the religious truths* which they were learning from him from day to day; and thus he not merely *taught* them, but he moulded and *formed* them; he not merely communicated to them *Christian knowledge*, but likewise *Christian sentiments and principles*; he not merely made them acquainted with religion, but likewise induced them to live as religion prescribes.

We think we have here pointed out the cause why many children, some of them innocent, and more the reverse, begin at an early age to live a life of virtue; and why, on the other hand, many others become, and remain, a prey to those evil passions and vices that so naturally spring up in the hearts of the young. The former are taught their religion, taught it by him who is capable of teaching it correctly and *effectively*—the priest; they are not merely taught it, but they are practised in it, trained in it. The latter class of children either are not taught religion at all, or they are taught it but imperfectly; or, if some fair amount of knowledge of it is given to them, it is a barren and fruitless knowledge, one that does not reach their hearts, draw out and *form their consciences*, seize upon and subdue their moral nature: it is a knowledge that *instructs*, but does not *educate*; that communicates *light*, but infuses no *heat*.

Whether, therefore, we look to the spiritual needs of the children, or the relations that subsist between them and their catechist; whether we regard the interests of their souls in this world or the world to come; whether we take into account the commandment of Christ laid upon every pastor of souls, or what our own knowledge and good sense suggest to us, there can be but one view with regard to the nature and end of Catechism, or of what we prefer to call catechistic work: it is to make *enlightened and good Christians* of the children. And that this has been at all times the view of the Church, the fathers, the doctors, the saints, of all enlightened priests and catechists, no one can entertain

a shadow of a doubt. "The Catechism," says the Bishop of Orleans, "is not simply *instruction*, it is *education*: it is not only to *teach* Christianity to the children, it is to *educate* the children in Christianity."

"There are three stages," he again writes, "in the work of the Catechism: there is the Catechism *recited*, the Catechism *explained*, and then the Catechism *practised*. The recitation without the explanation is nothing . . . the recitation and explanation without the practice is little better, for it is the practice of the Catechism that alone saves souls; it is the practice of the Catechism which alone makes Christians, which forms Christian minds and hearts, and wins to their Creator and their God those souls whom Jesus Christ has bought with His blood."

And Frassinetti writes:—"Teaching children Christian doctrine should not be a bare, dry teaching of the truths of faith, such as to tell them there is a God, there is a hell, &c.; but it should be a teaching full of life and vigour, which *inflames the heart* at the same time that it enlightens the mind."

If catechizing the children be what we have said, if it involves what we have laid down, then every catechist who understands his work will always keep in view these three great ends—(1) to make the children know the words of the Catechism; (2) to make them understand (according to the grade or stage they have reached) the meaning of what the Catechism contains; and (3) to effect that while religious knowledge is communicated to them, they be at the same time imbued with religious sentiments and principles. The first he will regard as important, the second as more important still, the last he will look upon as the most important of all; and if he directs the efforts of his skill and his zeal, if he adopts every possible expedient and resource to secure that the children know the words and their meaning, he will do so much more to touch the children's hearts, to awaken and form their consciences, to bring their wills, their souls, their lives, under the power and influence of the Christian teaching that is being given them.

W. WHERRY.

## THE PRIVILEGE OF ADRIAN IV. TO HENRY II.

## ADDITIONAL PROOFS IN FAVOUR OF ITS AUTHENTICITY.

AS the pages of the I. E. RECORD contain so much information on the subject of the Privilege of Pope Adrian IV. to King Henry II., I presume that the publication of some additional evidence in favour of what has been justly styled by the Very Rev. S. Malone, as one of "the best authenticated facts in the domain of history,"<sup>1</sup> will not be unacceptable.

In the first place, I would wish to call attention to the number of Popes who have cited the Privilege as a genuine document, without casting any suspicion of doubt on its authenticity. Could it be possible that the chief rulers of the Church would be so simple, and their Council of the Sacred College so unenlightened, as to allow themselves to be outwitted; and (as they claimed to be the Lords-paramount), *de facto*, to be deprived of their temporal dominion over Ireland by means of spurious Anglo-Norman Bulls? Indeed, it would be impossible to determine what historical documents may be genuine, if the Popes, of all men, in such an important matter, could be citing, age after age, a document as genuine which an illustrious and most learned Irish cardinal designates as "the spurious Bull of the much-maligned Pontiff, Adrian IV."

(1) Passing over the confirmatory Brief of Alexander III., the authenticity of which can scarcely be called into question, after the exhaustive article of the learned Dr. Malone in the I. E. RECORD of October, 1891, we have (2) in the year 1221, the account of a dispute between the Archbishop of Cashel and the English monarch, which was carried before Urban III. The king pleaded precedent in his favour "ever since the English had come to Ireland by direction of the Apostolic See."

(3) At the close of the thirteenth century, a dispensation in consanguinity was applied for by two powerful

<sup>1</sup> See I. E. RECORD (Third Series), October, 1891, vol. xii., page 865.

families in Meath. The grounds for application were the furtherance of those ends for which King Henry came to Ireland according to the good-will of the Apostolic See.<sup>1</sup> The Pope, in granting the dispensation, endorses, by quoting, without question, the grounds of the required dispensation.

(4) Early in the fourteenth century, the O'Neill, in the name of the Irish princes and people, addressing a statement of their grievances to Pope John XXII., declared that the matters complained of were in violation of the terms on which Adrian gave Ireland to Henry. Pope John in his commination to Edward II., directing the redress of the grievances thus brought under his notice, forwarded to the king, together with the statement of grievances, "a copy of the letters which the aforesaid Adrian, our predecessor, granted to Henry King of England, concerning Ireland."

(5) The Kings of England claim to have derived the title of Lords of Ireland from the Privilege of Adrian IV. Henry VIII. compelled an Anglo-Irish Parliament to bestow on him the title of King of Ireland. But, in the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary, a Bull was published by Pope Paul IV., in which Ireland was raised to the dignity of a kingdom, and reference made to the donation of Adrian in the following words:—"Whereas, ever since the dominion of Ireland was obtained from the Apostolic See by the Kings of England they always had styled themselves only Lords of Ireland, till Henry VIII., breaking away from the unity of the Catholic Church and obedience of the Roman Pontiff, usurped the kingly title."<sup>2</sup>

(6) That indefatigable explorer of the sacred history of his native land, Cardinal Moran, in his *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. i., page 113, gives a copy of a petition presented, in the year 1604 or 1605, to James I. by the Spanish ambassador in favour of the Irish Catholics. They declared it to be their "conviction that the title by which the Kings of England received dominion over them to be such as to require that they [the kings] should preserve the rights of the Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Theiner, ad an. 1290.

<sup>2</sup> Bullarium, Rom. Ed. Novissima.



religion whole and inviolate amongst them, in accordance with the letters granted by Adrian IV., which were printed the previous year, with other historical matters forwarded for that purpose from England to Frankfurt."

(7) Peter Lombard, the learned Archbishop of Armagh, in his *Commentary on Ireland*, dedicated to Pope Clement VIII., mentions, both in the preface and the body of the work, the donation of Adrian IV., as an unquestioned fact. In the last chapter reference is made to the representations forwarded by Hugh O'Neill and the Catholic confederates to the Holy See. The confederates in their representations urged that Rome was under a special obligation to assist in securing the freedom and safety of Ireland. "For, as it is certain that it was by the authority and direction of the Roman Pontiffs—of Adrian IV., in particular—that the Irish received the King of England as their lord, and as his rule has so degenerated as to threaten the destruction of the orthodox religion, the Irish Catholics are persuaded that Adrian's successors in the Apostolic chair *are bound in conscience* to afford every assistance to save them from impending destruction and ruin."

(8) Pope Innocent X., in the instructions, given with his sanction and by his direction, to the Nuncio Rinuccini for his guidance in Ireland, has the following:—"Ireland recognised no supreme prince save the Roman Pontiff; and Henry II., King of England, desiring to subjugate Ireland, had recourse to Adrian; and from that Pontiff, who was an Englishman, obtained with a liberal hand all that he asked. The zeal manifested by Henry in wishing to convert all Ireland to the faith, induced Adrian to bestow on him the dominion of that island."<sup>1</sup>

Considering the importance of this document, and that it was drawn up during what may be styled the golden age of Irish history, in the lifetime of Wadding, White, Rothe, and O'Daly, it is no wonder that the learned author of the *Confederation of Kilkenny* should declare that it "dispels all doubt of the authenticity of the Bull of Adrian IV."

<sup>1</sup>*Istruzione a Monsignor Rinuccini, Nunzio in Ibernia.*

(9) Moreover, we have in the history of the *Nunziatura*, page 256, a letter from the Nuncio himself, dated 1st October, 1617, and addressed to Cardinal Panzirolo, in which he complains of the publication of a book entitled, *An Apologetic Discussion*, printed at Frankfurt, and composed by an Irishman (a Jesuit) named Constantine Maolo (O'Mahony). "The scope of this work," writes the Nuncio, "is to stir up the Irish against the English heretics, and to induce them to elect a king of their own nation and of the old Irish blood, inasmuch as the English by their heresy had lost their dominion over Ireland, by the non-observance of the conditions imposed on them by Adrian IV."

(10) The learned and venerable Bishop of Ossory, David Rothe has left on record his belief in the authenticity of Adrian's Privilege, of the confirmatory Brief of Alexander III., and of their effect in having prevented any prolonged useless resistance to the Anglo-Norman invasion, outside of Ulster, on the part of the Irish clergy and princes.

(11) The distinguished and erudite Dominic O'Daly, at the time of his death Bishop-elect of Coimbra, the Portuguese Athens, wrote his *History of the Geraldines*, and dedicated it to Cardinals Antony and Francis Barberini, about the year 1650, at a time in which he should have a very accurate knowledge of the question of the authenticity of the Adrian Privilege: yet here is what he states, in his preface to the work: "Five hundred years have now passed away, since Adrian IV., an Englishman, conferred by his Bull, the title of Lord of Ireland on King Henry II. Far be it from me to examine whether flesh and blood prompted the Vicar of Christ to bestow on a king of his own nation the island of Erin on some vain and unfounded representations. Historians of great weight have asserted it. I enter not into the controversy, neither do I intend to assert that the head of the Church was deluded by the false statements of Henry, nor to argue with the Church concerning the justice of the fact."

On this it may be observed, first, that whatever may

<sup>1</sup> *Analecta*, page 94. Cardinal Moran's Edition.

have been its origin, the Popes up to the reign of Elizabeth did undoubtedly claim to be the temporal suzerains of Ireland. As late as the year 1570, we have a letter written by order of St. Pius V., from Cardinal Alciato to Dr. MacGibbon, Archbishop of Cashel, in which the Holy Father expresses his astonishment that the Archbishop and the confederate Catholics should attempt to offer the crown of Ireland to the King of Spain without the sanction of the Apostolic See, because Ireland “belongs to the dominion of the Church as fental territory—*ad Ecclesiasticam ditionem feudi nomine pertinere*.”<sup>1</sup> Secondly, with regard to the charges of moral deterioration and abuses of various kinds brought against the Irish Church and nation, it may have been, and indeed it is very likely, that these accusations were greatly exaggerated, as the English had always the advantage over us at Rome in what may be called the criminal investigation department. Still, these charges were substantially admitted by the ecclesiastical and lay chiefs of our nation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They appear in the letters of Alexander III. to the Irish Bishops, &c., and against the authenticity of these letters no shadow of a doubt has been raised. As that most painstaking and accurate writer and distinguished son of Ossory, Dr. M. Kelly, remarks in his essay on the Synod of Cashel and the English Invasion:—“Adrian knew perfectly well, through the Cardinal and the legate Christian, the real state of Ireland . . . For nearly one hundred years, since Gregory VII. wrote to Turlough O’Brien, the pacification and reformation of Ireland has been an object of deep interest to the Popes.”

Primate Lombard informs us<sup>2</sup> that Adrian IV., when only a simple missionary in Norway, acquired a full knowledge of the state of Ireland—“that there were many things in it which required reformation and correction, and from that time cherished a great desire of one day coming to the aid of a nation, which he knew to have been formerly most illustrious

<sup>1</sup>*Spic. Oss.*, vol. i., page 64.

<sup>2</sup>*Commentary on Ireland*, pp. 102, 103.

for its sanctity. His English experience also must of itself have been a powerful motive to induce him to give his sanction to the design of Henry II.

For, as Cardinal Newman observes, in his eloquent sketch, entitled *The Northmen and Normans in England and Ireland*, there was a parallelism in the fortunes of England and Ireland. Internal dissensions followed in both countries from the invasion of the Northmen, even after their expulsion, and the decline of religion and morality.

"It was, surely, incumbent on that power which had converted them, to interfere when they were lapsing back into barbarism. Everyone has a love and a care for his own work, and if children are not always fond of their parents, at least, the parents, as the great philosopher says, commonly yearn in affection over the children. Rome had had a great success in English and Irish zeal; it had no wish that that success should be reversed. But at this time the people of England were sunk in sloth, luxury, and depravity; and Ireland was convulsed with feuds and conflicts, their scholars having as little power to restore order, ecclesiastical or civil, as faith to ensure clarity.

What should the Pope do? He took time to deliberate on the course to be pursued, and then he acted boldly. He applied one and the same remedy to both islands. He did not send one island to convert the other; he did not send the debased English to heal the quarrel of the Irish; he did not send those who sold their own children to the Irish to heal it over the Irish who bought them. He sent against each of them, in its turn, the soldiers of a young and ambitious people—first to reform them; secondly, to unite them together; and, strange to say, the warlike host he sent was an offshoot of the very race which had brought them both to ruin. The Northmen had been their bane, and, in the intention of the Pope, the Normans were to be their antidote."

It is true that the success of the Anglo-Normans in the subjugation of Ireland, as far as it was a success, was mainly due to the old curse of Irish dissension, and to the superior military skill and equipment of the invaders; but



opposition. In the first letter of Alexander III., it is stated that the kings and princes of Ireland received Henry as their king and lord.<sup>1</sup> In his second letter, the Pope mentions that he had received a letter from the bishops of Ireland reporting Henry's success, and the commencement of a better state of things in Ireland. In the third letter, addressed to Henry himself, Pope Alexander expresses his delight at the reported improvement in Ireland: "Ea quae tam illicite fiunt, incipiunt jam desistere;" and he exhorts the king to persevere in the work of reformation, and imposes it as an obligation on him to do so for the forgiveness of his sins: "In remissionem tibi peccatorum injungimus."

Dr. Rothe states<sup>2</sup> that the Bull of Adrian, and the confirmatory diploma of Alexander, obtained the consent of the clergy and princes who were unable to make a successful resistance. And Primate Lombard informs us<sup>3</sup> that, although some of the chief princes of Ireland openly refused to receive Henry as their lord, and were able to maintain a successful resistance, many did acknowledge him as their lord, partly moved by the privilege granted to him by the Apostolic See, and partly compelled to do so by superior force and fear: *subacti vi, vel coacti metu.*

The Anglo-Norman rule, as the Popes themselves would be the first to admit, was for centuries more of a bane than a blessing, except in so far as it brought material advantages and a higher civilization and culture in those parts of Ireland occupied by the Norman colony: "Per eandem Domini translationem cultiores seu civiliores multo quam ante fuerant mores sint inducti atque artes, in ea loca quae erant occupata ab Anglorum coloniis."<sup>4</sup>

In addition to the papers published in the I. E. RECORD, the "Privilege of Adrian" has been made a subject of

<sup>1</sup> None of the Ulster princes except O'Carroll of Orgiall submitted to Henry.

<sup>2</sup> *Analecta*, page 94.

<sup>3</sup> *Commentary*, page 107.

<sup>4</sup> Lombard, page 107.

Gasquet, who also wrote an article in the *Dublin Review*, endorsing the arguments of the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, against the authenticity of the Privilege. The points, in the article of the Very Rev. Vicar-General of Killaloe, to which I would wish to call attention, are:—1st, his reply to the argument taken from the apparent ignoring of Adrian's grant, at the Synod of Cashel. "How," writes the Very Rev. and learned Doctor, "could we expect that the bishops of a national Church, presided over by a Roman Legate, would have assembled at the bidding of a foreign potentate, coming, as Henry did, to the Irish, if he had not spoken of the authority and commission with which he was charged? Had he come, beating down all opposition, and had he commanded individual bishops, with the sword at their throats, it is possible they would have been overawed. But, considering the circumstances under which the bishops met, and that Henry lay under the imputation of abetting the murder of St. Thomas, it is unlikely that he spoke to the bishops, or that they would have obeyed, in a matter touching spiritual jurisdiction, if he had not satisfied them as to his authority from Pope Adrian. One of the decrees of the Synod enjoined that the ritual and liturgy of the Irish Church should thenceforth be modelled on the English form. Are we to suppose that the Irish Church surrendered its national customs and rites, at the suggestion of a layman, without an intimation of the Pope's will?"

2nd. To Cardinal Moran's assertion, that, "In 1155," the year of the grant, "Ireland was not in a state of turmoil, or verging towards barbarism; on the contrary, it was rapidly progressing," &c., Dr. Malone replies, by citing from the *Annals of the Four Masters*, 1151. They tell us that there was a battle between Munster men and Connaught men with the men of Meath and Leinster. Of the Munster men alone, there fell in battle 7,000! Again, in the year 1154, the annalists tell us that the fleet of Turlough O'Connor swept the northern seas, plundering Tirconnell and

Inishowen, with dreadful slaughter on both sides : that an army was led from the north, by the O'Lochlain, who banished the O'Reillys from the principality of Brefney, and destroyed the crops ; that a battle was fought between the O'Briens and the people of Carlow, in which the chief of the O'Nowlans fell ; that Tiernan O'Rorke led a devastating army into Leinster, plundering churches and the whole country ; that Desmond preyed on the Dalgais, and that the Dalcassians preyed on the Desmond ; and that the chief of Colleckmore was done to death, even at the very door of the Church of Birr.

With such evidence before us, one must agree with the conclusion arrived at by the learned Vicar-General of Killaloe, that all Ireland was “a vast human shambles,” or a “trembling sod,” as it was described in the quaint language of the old chronicler. Dr. Malone also contradicts the assertion of those who allege that Peter of Blois, Secretary of Henry the Second, made no mention of the Bull of Adrian, or that in Jaffe's *Regesta*, a single trace of it cannot be found. Owing to the plundering of Rome on various occasions, and the dispersion of its literary treasures, the original copy of this Bull of Adrian has been lost, with many other valuable documents ; but its substance, and very words, have been preserved in Irish, English, and Roman documents, including all the latest and best editions of the Bullarium. It has, as we have seen, been referred to, and cited as authentic in every age, by popes, cardinals, chronicles, rolls of parliament, and all our most erudite historians. The weight of evidence, judged by any standard, is altogether in favour of its authenticity. If our opponents can succeed in proving that Adrian did not allow himself to be deceived or imposed upon by Henry the Second, who, in 1154, was a promising young sovereign of about twenty-two years of age, it must be at the expense of many other Popes, who must, according to their theory, have allowed themselves to be deceived by Anglo-Norman forgers.

A very able writer and critic, Father Jungman, a Belgian, on account of the arguments and authority of Cardinal Moran, considers<sup>1</sup> the authenticity of the Bull as doubtful.

<sup>1</sup> In vol. v. of his *Dissertationes Selectae*.

But he lessens the force of his own reasoning and research, by quoting, with approval, the Cardinal's statement, that the "Irish Nation at all times, and unhesitatingly, pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery." Sometimes, the Irish may have contended that the Bull was not a valid one, inasmuch as it was obtained under false pretences, or that its conditions were violated by the English themselves, as they observe in their formal complaint to Pope John XXII.; but there is no evidence that the Irish Nation at all times pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery. Primate Lombard devoted an entire chapter (xviii.) of his Treatise to a relation of all the complaints of the Irish against the English rule; but he does not even mention the charge, that it owed its origin to a forged Papal Bull. Father O'Mahony's work, as the Nuncio informs us, excited a great commotion in Ireland, in 1647, during the lifetime of Rothe, Wadding, &c.; and his charge is that the English forfeited their right to rule Ireland, because they were heretics, and because they did not observe the conditions by which they held Ireland from Adrian IV., "con le quali ebbero l'Ibernia da Adriano IV." Finally, the learned editor of the *Analecta* maintains that the Popes did not claim any special dominion over Ireland as a temporal fief, save what was included in the enfeoffment of his dominions to Innocent III. by King John. Pope Innocent X., in his instructions to Monsignor Rinuccini, already cited, states that Ireland recognised no supreme prince save the Roman Pontiff; that Ireland had been then for full five centuries subject to the Apostolic See, as a tributary territory; and that the Nuncio's mission was to bring them all back to the sweet yoke of the Pontifical sway in spiritual matters. St. Pius V. claimed Ireland as part of the feudal territory of the Church.

Dr. Rothe, in the *Analecta* (page 113), has a paragraph with the title, *Hibernia Romanæ Ecclesiæ rectigalis*:—"What is extraordinary," says Edmund Burke, "is that for a very long time, even quite down to the Reformation, and in the most solemn Acts, the kings of England founded their title wholly on this grant [of Adrian]; they called for obedience from the people of Ireland, not on principles of subjection,



but as vassals and mean lords between them and the Popes.”<sup>1</sup> The supposition, then, of the authenticity of the Privilege harmonizes with, and supplies a key to, all the facts of our civil and ecclesiastical history. From a secular point of view, it is full of most useful reflection and instruction to all Irishmen. And, from an ecclesiastical standpoint—because whatever is true, as our Leo of the heavenly light teaches us, must count for the advantage of the Church—the policy of the Popes in dealing with Ireland from the time of Adrian to that of Leo, proves that they were always Ireland’s best friends, and that the line of royal Popes continued through weal and woe to be loving fathers and protectors to their loyal spiritual children of the isle of destiny—ancient, yet ever young.

N. MURPHY, P.P.

## Theological Questions.

### FAST AND ABSTINENCE AT SEA.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—What are the laws of the Church as to *fasting and abstinence at sea*?

“1. Is it right to say to our Catholic people, going to Australia or America, ‘Take what you get; take what is put on the table before you’?

“2. It is the eve of the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. Am I doing what is wrong by eating meat at every meal?

“3. Can I eat fish and flesh at the same meal on Fridays and fast days?”

1. The causes which excuse from fasting and abstinence, generally, are—exhaustive labour, delicacy of health, and insufficiency of fasting fare. Old age too excuses, or rather exempts, one altogether from the law of fasting. Now voyagers, like all other persons, are bound by the laws of the Church,

<sup>1</sup> *Tracts on the Popery Laws.*

unless they are excused from their observance by some legitimate cause. Old age, of course, will excuse from the obligation of fasting. Delicacy likewise, whether habitual, or temporary and incidental to the voyage, will excuse from fast and abstinence, as far as the exigencies of the particular case may require. The question of exhaustive labour does not arise; and we have therefore only to consider the question of food. Are our Catholic voyagers supplied with meagre fare on fast days and days of abstinence? And if it be not usually supplied, may they hope to get it, by notifying to the Officials on board that they are Catholics, and that they require fasting fare?

2. We confess that we have some difficulty with this branch of the case. It is easy to state the abstract doctrine that insufficiency of fasting fare will excuse. But as we are quite unfamiliar with the circumstances of passengers to America or Australia—and it is to such a long voyage our correspondent refers—we have some difficulty in offering with any confidence, a solution of the concrete case proposed by our correspondent. There is obviously a great difference between travelling on land and on sea. In the former case persons can generally get sufficiently good fasting fare by giving due notice at their hotels; in the latter case it may not be possible to get a suitable meal of fasting fare. Our correspondent, too, seems to suppose that our co-religionists, and notably the poor, cannot expect to get special and separate treatment on fast days and days of abstinence. Starting then with this assumption, we would distinguish between cabin and steerage passengers. And we would say of steerage passengers what Gury says of soldiers living in camps or barracks: “Excusantur milites qui in castris vel contuberniis versantur, et expensis Gubernii in communi nutriuntur, quia carnes semper ipsis ministrantur, et absque nimia difficultate alii cibi præberi non possent.”<sup>1</sup> We would say, then, of steerage passengers:—

(a) A voyage is not of itself, and independently of illness, &c., a sufficient cause to excuse from *fasting*.

<sup>1</sup> *Casus Consc.*, vol. i., n. 484.

(b) On fast days and days of abstinence they may take whatever is put before them *at the principal meal*. And we think a priest may tell them this before starting.

(c) We think it is not lawful for them to take meat *at every meal*. The law of abstinence is *negative*, it binds *semper et pro semper*, and also *modo divisibili*: and as even steerage passengers can have a sufficiently good breakfast, on fasting fare, they should abstain from meat at breakfast, &c. This partial abstinence will be, moreover, a declaration of their Catholicity, and a manifestation of respect for the laws of the Church.

(d) We think that fish and flesh may be taken by them at the same meal; but only at the principal meal, unless they are excused both from fast and abstinence. There is no difficulty about *Fridays*, as the law forbidding fish and flesh at the same meal regards only *fast days* and the *Sundays in Lent*: it does not regard ordinary Fridays. Then as regards fast days, the restriction affects only those who take meat by virtue of a dispensation, those who are excused from abstinence *vi indulti*; it does not affect those who are excused from abstinence independently of dispensation or indult, *e.g.*, those who are excused by reason of severe illness. Of these, therefore, Sabetti writes: "*Hic autem sedulo est animadvertendum hanc responsionem [de non miscendis piscibus cum carne] non afflicere eos qui tempore quadragesimæ carnes edunt quotidie ex stricta necessitate et consulto medicorum, non autem proprie vi indulti.*"<sup>1</sup> We, too, may say the same of steerage passengers. They are excused from abstinence, not *vi indulti*, but from strict necessity, because it is impossible for them to get suitable fasting food during a long voyage, such as to America or Australia.

3. With regard to cabin passengers, we distinguish between them and steerage passengers, because it is much more likely that they can get suitable fasting fare, if they apply for it. Of course they may be excused by old age or infirmity; but if they can get suitable meagre food, they cannot claim exemption from fast or abstinence on the

<sup>1</sup> N. 334, q. 7, page 243.

ground of the insufficiency of fasting fare. If, however, they are not supplied with suitable meagre fare, then we should apply to them the principles already laid down for steerage passengers.

## II.

### "PULLING" HORSES AT RACES, AND BETTING.

"An homo qui equorum suorum nomina in cursum dat ipso facto contractum init.

"(a) James White confesses that three weeks ago he entered his horse for a race, but on the day of the race itself he forbade his jockey to win. He knew not whether the horse could win or not. The horse was 'pulled,' however, with the object of having light weights on for a race far more value next month. Is this lawful?

"(b) What if the horse could easily win?

"(c) A bookmaker says he gave a jockey £300 to pull his horse: by the transaction £500 came into the possession of the bookmaker. *Amne Eccl.?*

"(d) Nicholas White keeps a racehorse, but secretly by betting against him, and ordering the jockey to 'pull' the horse, he wins £800. Is it lawful?

"(e) The same man keeps a 'gambling-house.' He sees that no cheating is carried on, but, owing to his cleverness, he makes a splendid living."

1. Before replying to our correspondent we will consider in a general way—1. The obligations of horse-owners towards the betting-men, and in reference to a race that is being presently run. 2. Certain obligations in reference to future races. 3. The practice of betting "against" horses, and then bribing or ordering the jockeys to "pull" these horses in order to win the bets. Then, 4, we will reply specifically to the several questions proposed by our correspondent. First, therefore:—

### § 1.

Is the owner of a racehorse bound towards the betting-men to run a *bona fide* race? are the bets void, if he orders his jockey to "pull" the horse? and if the horse has been "pulled," and the bet paid, is he bound to make restitution to the man who lost the wager?



2. In this case we suppose that the owner of the racehorse does not bet himself; and, before replying to the question, we will premise a few remarks about the conditions necessary for a valid bet or wager. A bet always presupposes some dispute or difference of opinion. And to be valid—1, the parties to the bet must be *uncertain* about the question in dispute; 2, the disputed question or event must be understood by all *in the same sense*; 3, they must severally have the intention of paying the wager if they lose; and 4, the bet must be *de re licita*. Now *his præmissis*.

3. Crolley (vol. ii., n. 662) seems to think that if a horse is “pulled” the bet is *in all cases* unjust; that if the money is paid by the losing man, it should be returned to him; moreover, that if the winner of the bet knew that the horse would be “pulled,” he should pay the loser what he would have won if the race were run in a *bona fide* manner; and, finally, that the owner of the horse in default of the recipient of the bet, should make full reparation to the man who lost the wager:—

“Manifestum est [he writes] hunc contractum [sponsionis] injustum esse, quum ex fraude, æqualitas inter contrahentes necessario ex justitia servanda, aufertur. Hoc multis modis fit, sed præsertim quum, in cursu equestri, dominus equi velocissimi mandat equiti certamine vinci, unde ii, qui sponponderunt eum victurum, injuste tum sua pecunia tum spe lucri privantur. Omnes itaque qui lucrum ex hoc modo agendi fecerunt, etiamsi fraudem ignoraverint, veritate comperta lucrum acceptum restituere tenentur, quia reapse in contractu non erat æqualis spes lucri et periculum damni. Ii vero qui hoc modo iniquo agendi cognito sponsionem fecerunt non tantum lucrum acceptum restituere tenentur, sed præterea id quod alter contrahens nisi ob hanc fraudem ab iis lucrasset, et dominus equi non solum sicut alii restituere tenetur, sed etiam aliis deficientibus totum damnum, in quantum id præviderit, reparare tenetur.”

4. We regret that we cannot accept the teaching of the illustrious moralist in its entirety. There are undoubtedly cases where the bets are voided if the horses are “pulled,” and where all parties to the fraud are bound to restitution; but we are equally certain that a racehorse may in certain circumstances be “pulled,” without prejudice to the validity of the bets, and without any violation of the virtue of justice.

To discriminate between these different cases we shall have to make three hypotheses.

5. (i.) If the man who bets *against* a horse had *previously* entered into collusion with the owner or rider, and had therefore known *beforehand* that the horse would be "pulled," the bet is manifestly invalid. Because this man runs no risk; for him there is no uncertainty; the result is absolutely certain. If, then, the bet were paid, it should be returned to its owner. Moreover, he should be reconqued for his losses consequent on the injustice perpetrated on him, if they were sufficiently foreseen. And he should, therefore, be paid what he would have won if the race were run in a just and proper manner. It would, undoubtedly, be very difficult to determine what he would have won in other circumstances. The fraudulent betting man might not have wagered at all if he were compelled to bet according to the laws of justice; and it may be very difficult to determine what the injured party would have won from others, or whether he would have bet with others at all. Hence it would be often impracticable to urge this additional restitution. Moreover, as Crolley remarks, the injured parties to these bets are generally satisfied if their own money is restored to them: "*Sed si qui damna passi sunt hoc modo, plerumque sponte, in compensationem totius damni, restitutionem pecunie, quae ab iis injuste ablata est, acciperent.*" (*Ibid.*)

With regard to the *order* in which the different culprits should make restitution—(a) if the "collusion" were such that the unjust betting-man acted as *mandans*, and the owner of the horse, or the rider, as *exequens*, then the betting-man is bound to make full restitution to the injured party, and only when he fails is the owner of the horse, or the rider, bound to make the restitution. But (b) if the "collusion" were such that they acted each in his own name and for his own interests; if the money fraudulently won were to be divided among them; then they are severally and absolutely bound to make restitution *pro rata*; and if anyone fails, the other or others are bound to pay his share also.

Finally, we may remark that, even independently of

collusion between a betting-man and the owner of a race-horse, the bet would be invalid if the betting-man knew from some other source that the horse would certainly be "pulled."

6. (ii.) We may suppose a second case in which a bet had been properly made, but *after* the bet had been made, the man who bet against the horse induced the owner or rider to "pull" the horse. In this case the bet was *ab initio* valid, but the subsequent collusion between the betting-man and the owner or rider was certainly unjust. That the bet was valid, will be seen later on. That the subsequent tampering with the bet was unjust, is quite manifest; because when two persons make a bet, neither should subsequently interfere to deprive the other of all chance of winning. Hence it is manifest that the man who bet against the horse, and subsequently tampered with the owner or rider, violated justice; and the owner or rider by co-operating with him violated justice also. Hence they are all bound to restitution as in the preceding case.

7. (iii.) But, thirdly, if there be no collusion with the betting-man, we hold that a horse owner is not bound *towards the betting-man* to run a *bona fide* race; and that, even though the horse be pulled, the bets are still valid (a) "He is not bound *towards the betting-man* to run a *bona fide* race." Betting is not confined to horse-racing. There is scarcely a contest of any kind that is not seized on as an outlet for the betting passion. And shall we say, for example, that a candidate for parliamentary honours is bound towards the betting-men to put forth all his energy to win the seat, and that he may not retire from the contest, lest those who bet on him should lose the wager? Or, that a candidate for a fellowship in a university, or for, let us say, a medical or legal appointment, may not withdraw from the struggle, lest his betting supporters should suffer disaster? Or, that an athlete may not cancel his engagements, or voluntarily lose a race, without any violation of justice towards the betting-men? It is obvious that the parties to these contests owe no obligation to the betting-men, and that they may retire prior to the actual contest or during the contest. And, similarly, the owner of a racehorse may have his horse

"scratched" prior to the engagement, or may have his horse "pulled" during the race, without any violation of justice, so far as the betting men are concerned. He may not enter into collusion with one party to a bet to the detriment of the other; but excluding this collusion, he owes them no obligation whatever in justice.

*do* "Even if the horse be pulled the bets are still valid." Undoubtedly, *uncertainty* as to the result of a race is an essential element for betting. But *objective* uncertainty and *objective* equality as to the chance of winning are not necessary for the validity of a bet. We can suppose, for example, two persons that are not over familiar with the laws of the Church, to be disputing whether the vigil of Christmas is a fast day or not. A contends it is a fast day, though he is really uncertain about it; and B maintains that it is not a fast day. They make a bet, and agree to abide by the decision of a priest or the Catholic Directory. Now this bet is manifestly valid; though from the beginning it was *objectively certain* that Christmas Eve is a fast day, and that B had no chance of winning. *Subjective* uncertainty, therefore, suffices for the validity of a bet. And if we exclude collusion between the owner or rider of a horse and one party to a bet, the betting-men may be *subjectively* uncertain of the issue, and may believe they have an equal chance of winning the wager, even though the horse be "pulled," and therefore even though *objectively* one of them should have no chance of winning. Hence, in the absence of fraud, the betting on a horse should be considered valid even though the horse were pulled.

8. A difficulty may sometimes arise about the *meaning* of a bet; and it may be doubtful whether the event, on which the bet was made, *was understood by all in the same sense*. For example, a person bets that A will get *more votes* at a parliamentary election than B, and that he will be elected. A then retires, and B is returned without a contest. Now, though B is elected, he does not get *more votes* than A; and, consequently, a controversy might arise as to the meaning of the bet. It might be asserted that the point to be decided was the *election* of member of Parliament, abstracting from the manner of electing him; and again, it



might be contended that the bet presupposed, besides the actual election, a real contest and the casting of votes. Such disputes, however, about the *meaning* of a bet can be decided only by the betting-men themselves. And as regards bets on races, we think they regard solely the final issue of the race, and that their validity is not at all affected by the absence of a horse from the racecourse, or by the fact that he may have been "pulled" by the rider.

## § 2.

### CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS IN REFERENCE TO FUTURE RACES.

9. Two questions arise under this heading—(1) is it lawful for a horse-owner to "pull" his horse with a view to having *light weight* at a *future race*? and (2) is it lawful for the owner or rider to bet *on the horse* at the future race?

10. With regard to the first question, if we consider the *owners* of the different horses at a race, it would appear that no one of them has a strict right that the horse of another should be weighted in a particular manner. Abstracting from the racing rules, how could a horse-owner have a right that his rival's horse should be handicapped? But we have also to consider the racing committee. This committee provides stakes, and in order to make the races interesting, it equalizes the different candidates for these stakes by a careful system of handicapping. Now a difficulty arises: does the racing committee regard this handicapping as a kind of penal law, or does it regard it as a condition to be conscientiously observed, so that if a person secures an unduly light and favourable handicapping, he cannot lawfully accept the stakes, should he win the race? The committee, undoubtedly, *could* make such a regulation; but we doubt if their laws are to be so understood. A person, for example, may never have run his horse before, and may so conceal his merits as to secure a disproportionately favourable handicapping, and yet no one would say that he acts unjustly in not informing the handicapper of his horse's superior merits. Again, an athlete who intentionally loses a race with a view to more favourable handicapping at a future race, is not considered guilty of injustice.

And similarly, we think that a man who "pulls" his horse with a view to having lighter weight at a future race is not guilty of injustice, and may accept the stakes of the future race, should he win it. Of course, we speak throughout of the *morality* of the act. We have not to consider whether it is honourable or dishonourable. And we think, too, that these attempted frauds rarely deceive the capable and vigilant official handicapper. Finally, if the horse-owner is arraigned before the racing authorities for fraud or attempted deception, he must, of course, abide by their ruling.

11. To pass to the second question, we ask, "Is it lawful to bet *on* the horse at the future race?" A person, for example, has his horse entered for a future race: he is unrivalled, let us suppose, in estimating the relative merits of horses, and he is quite certain that his own horse can easily beat any of the other horses entered for this future race. Meanwhile his horse is engaged to run another race presently, and he "drugs" the horse, or "pulls" him, and loses the race, in order to deceive the public, and create the impression that the horse is unable to win the future race. The public then bet *against* the horse; the owner bets a considerable sum *on* the horse, and wins; has he acted lawfully, and may he keep the bet?

Equal hope of success is essential to betting. One party to a bet may, no doubt, regard his view of the case as perfectly certain; and if this is known to his opponent, who still persists in betting, many think the bet is valid.<sup>1</sup> But in the present case the owner of the horse is certain of winning the bet; moreover, so far from revealing his views to the other betting-men, he deceives the public about the merits of his horse, and fraudulently induces them to bet *against* the horse. Hence, 1. he is guilty of injustice *affective*, when he pulls his horse in order to deceive the public and induce them to bet against the horse at a future race. 2. If he wins the bet, as he was practically certain of winning it, he is bound to restore it, and also indemnify the other betting-men for any losses he may have caused them;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Layman, L. iii., Tr. iv., cap. xxi., n. 4.

An exception to this rule may be seen in Crolly, p. 670: "Præterea si Caius qui se certum credidit tempore spon- sionis postea comperat eventum revera fuisse incertum, potest lucrum accipere si vicerit, quia re vera se periculo damni exposuit; quamvis contra suam conscientiam spon- dendo peccavit." 3. If through some unforeseen and accidental circumstance he should lose the race, might the winners regard the bet as valid, and retain the wager? We think they might: sometimes for the reason just given from Crolly, and also because the fraudulent betting-man is bound to indemnify his opponents for the losses they may have sustained—for what they might have won; and oftentimes this can be done only by regarding the bet as valid, and requiring him to pay the winners. 4. Finally, when the fraudulent betting-man is not absolutely certain of winning, but when the great weight of probability is on his side, a corresponding proportion should be observed in the amount that is bet on both sides. In general, therefore, to conclude this portion of the subject, this kind of betting should be prohibited as *unlawful*.

### § 3.

Is it lawful for a bookmaker to bribe a jockey, or for a master to order his jockey to "pull" the horse, and by betting *against* him win the wager?

12. (1) It is unlawful for the *bookmaker*. (*a*) He is guilty of injustice towards the owner of the horse, by depriving him of his chance of winning the race; and should indemnify him for his lost *chance*. (*b*) He is guilty of injustice towards the betting-men: because he knows the horse will be pulled, and, therefore, by betting *against* the horse he is *certain* to win the wager, while the others have *no chance* of winning; and hence the bet is invalid. The bookmaker is, therefore, bound to restore the bets, and also to indemnify the others for the losses they may have sustained through his criminal tampering with the jockey.

(2) It is unlawful for the owner to order the jockey to pull his horse with a view to betting *against* him. In this case, too, the bets are invalid, and the owner is bound to *make* restitution, as in the preceding case.

## § 4.

13. We will now briefly reply to our correspondent's questions.

I. We think that a man who enters his horse for a race does not thereby bind himself by contract to run a *bona fide* race.

II. Excluding the intention of betting at a future race, we think it is not unjust or unlawful to "pull" a horse at an earlier race, with a view to having light weight at a future race. The official handicapper may be relied upon in all cases to equalize horses sufficiently. Nor do we think the case altered even if the horse could easily win the first race.

III. It was unlawful for the jockey to accept the £300, and pull his master's horse; but *post factum*, as in the case of every *contractus turpis*, he might keep the money. The bookmaker acted unjustly towards the owner of the horse and towards the betting-men, and consequently is bound to compensate the owner for his lost *chance* of winning the race and the betting-men for their actual losses, and for what they might have won if he had not acted unjustly towards them. In default of the bookmaker, the jockey is bound to make restitution.

IV. Nicholas White, of course, is bound to restore the £800, and otherwise to compensate the losers, as in the preceding case.

14. Finally, as to the "gambling-house," we would say—1. That it is not intrinsically immoral to keep a gambling-house: it is not, for example, *per se* immoral to carry about roulette and card-tables, &c., to races and fairs; and similarly, we do not consider it *per se* intrinsically immoral to keep all these appliances actively engaged in a particular gambling-house. 2. Gambling-houses must, therefore, be judged by their fruits; we must weigh their advantages and disadvantages; and their advantages are generally confined to the proprietors, while their disadvantages affect the general public. Hence, 3, we have to consider how far the owner of a gambling-house is guilty of *active* scandal, how far his establishment induces persons to



commit excess in games of chance, and allures to various other criminal habits; and then we might compare them to public-houses and other similar fruitful occasions of sin. 4. For ourselves we should prefer to see this question discussed by some priest who, from his missionary experience, may have some practical knowledge of the evils caused by gambling-houses. We can lay claim to no such knowledge. We would, however, be slow in saying that it is *sinful* to keep a gambling-house. There are many practices which a priest should endeavour to eradicate, though they may not be demonstrably *sinful*: practices, for example, that are on the one hand unnecessary, and, on the other, dangerous and unbecoming to Catholics. It is, moreover, often very difficult, if not impossible, to estimate accurately the proportion of advantages and disadvantages that are connected with a particular practice or line of action. Hence we think a priest should be slow in pronouncing the owner of a particular gambling-house guilty of mortal sin. He should certainly remind him of his obligation to suppress abuses. If he could completely put an end to gambling-houses, he should do so. But if the suppression of one should mean the opening of others, over which perhaps he would have no control, then we think it would be better to tolerate one which is said to be well conducted, than, by destroying it, to call others into existence, which would only multiply and intensify the evils intended to be remedied.

DANIEL COGHLIN.

---

## Liturgical Questions.

---

### I.

#### THE "VISIT TO A CHURCH," &c., FOR GAINING A PLENARY INDULGENCE.

"REV. DEAR SIR.—The practical importance of the point will be sufficient justification for troubling you with a few questions regarding indulgences.

"Everyone is aware that to gain an indulgence, 'a faithful performance of the works enjoined is necessary.' Now among the conditions for a plenary indulgence, besides Confession and Holy Communion, a *visit to some church*, and prayers for the intentions of the Holy Father, are required.

"The following is the usual formula:—'Qui vere poenitentes, confessi, ac sacra Communione refecti, aliquam Ecclesiam visitaverint, ac ibi per aliquod tempus preces effuderint,' &c.

"Now what is the meaning of this last condition? and how must it be fulfilled?

"I have frequently consulted fellow-priests, and find considerable diversity of opinion about it. The greater number hold that the *prayers* in question may be said before or after the Mass at which a person communicates—the Mass on a Sunday or Holiday of obligation is meant: the remainder, without exception, hold that it is sufficient to leave the church after Mass, and then return and say the prayers, &c., to fulfil the above condition of 'a *visit to some church*,' &c.

"I confess I have never been able to satisfy myself that either opinion is right. I was not willing to urge my views: still less to lay them before the people, in face of the almost unanimous judgment of my brethren.

"But the decision of the question regarding the 'Benedictio in articulo mortis,' in which, like yourself, I found myself at variance with my fellow-priests, suggests the advisability of opening the subjects in the pages of the I. E. RECORD.

"If I am mistaken, no harm will have been done. If my view be correct, the sooner it becomes known the better; for the belief is very generally entertained that the condition prescribed for gaining a plenary indulgence, is complied with by the first of

the methods indicated, while no one seems to doubt that at least the second method is sufficient.

“1st. Will prayers said at or after Mass do?

“I do not see on what authority it can be answered in the *affirmative*. I exclude the case where the indulgence is granted in favour of some *particular church*. I speak of the ordinary indulgences; *e.g.*, of the first Sunday of the month, of some great feast, &c. And I suppose the Mass at which one receives Holy Communion is a Mass of obligation.

“Now the well-known principle applies here, that ‘works otherwise obligatory will not suffice for those prescribed as a condition of gaining an indulgence’ (unless *specially* permitted). Besides, in the Rescript, &c., a *special* (formal) *visit*, distinct from that to Mass, at which Communion is received, is mentioned.

“Where, and by what authority, is that dispensed with? The *onus probandi* is on those who do not require a *distinct* visit.

“The same difficulty seems to be in the way of admitting the second method; *i.e.*, assuming that in the *original* Rescript, &c., a distinct visit for the purpose of offering prayers for the Pope’s intentions was required.

“The *visit itself* seems to be emphasized.

“The only reason I can see for holding that one may fulfil the condition by leaving the church after Mass, and returning immediately, and offering the prayers, is, that such a thing was allowed some years ago in regard to the indulgence of the jubilee, after permission had been given to make *more than one visit on the same day*. But that was a special concession for a particular indulgence. We are not allowed to extend that concession without authority. Where is the authority for doing so?

On the other hand, if a distinct visit be required, it will entail great hardships on country people, for instance, unless the Confessor commutes the visit to some other pious work.

“SENANUS.”

Our correspondent will be glad to learn that his views on the above-mentioned condition for gaining a plenary indulgence are somewhat too severe. The condition of visiting a church is fulfilled by going to the church to hear the Mass at which Communion is received, even though the Mass be one of obligation. The ingenious objection against

this which our correspondent raises would be of some weight were the hearing of Mass, instead of the visit to the church, the condition for gaining the indulgence. Our authority is the *Raccolta* itself. The English translation from which we quote the following paragraph has been specially approved by the Congregation of Indulgences:—

"Any person, who on the day appointed for gaining an indulgence, receives Communion in the Church which is to be visited, and there offers pious prayers to God, is to be considered as having satisfied the obligation of Communion, *of the visit*, and of the pious prayers enjoined for the gaining of the plenary indulgence."<sup>1</sup>

When one can gain on the same day several plenary indulgences, for each of which a visit to a church is a prescribed condition, he fulfils this condition by merely leaving the church and entering it again, without returning home, or even departing to any distance from the church. This statement is taken from the same authentic source as the preceding. These are the words of the *Raccolta* bearing on the latter point:—

"When one intends on the same day to gain several plenary indulgences by means of a single Confession and Communion, and for each indulgence a visit is required, he must in virtue of a decree dated Feb. 29, 1861, make as many visits as there are indulgences which he intends to gain. Hence it is necessary for each successive visit *to leave the church and enter it again*."

## II.

### THE METHOD OF KNOTTING THE CINCTURE.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly state in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD whether there is not a special rule or rubric to be observed by the celebrant in *knottling the cincture* when vesting for Mass? This question was asked a short time ago in my presence, and the answer given was not, to me, satisfactory.

"A SUBSCRIBER."

The rubrics of the Missal are quite silent on the question raised by our correspondent. The only direction they give regarding the putting on of the cincture is the following:—

<sup>1</sup> Introd. n. 7.



“et cingulo per ministrum a tergo sibi porrecto se cingit.” There is, consequently, no mention of the way in which the cincture is to be knotted, and hence each one is free to use that method which appears to him most convenient.

D. O'LOAN.

## Documents.

### DECREES OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF RITES.

#### SUMMARY.

I. Mass of the Sacred Heart for the first Friday of the month.

II. Mass or commemoration of the anniversary of the consecration of the bishop of the diocese to be transferred *in primam sequentem diem non impeditam*, when it occurs on a double of the first class.

III. The Solemn Mass in celebration of the anniversary of the election of the Pope, or the consecration of the Ordinary need not be celebrated in other churches than the cathedral.

VI. The priest is to stand obliquely to the altar, when saying the last Gospel at Mass.

VII. A question regarding the Votive Office of the Immaculate Conception in certain dioceses of Hungary.

VIII. A priest saying a Votive Office in Lent, &c., may say the Ferial Mass with a commemoration of the Votive Mass.

IX. The Commemoration of the Cross made in the Office *tempore paschali* is to be omitted in the Votive Offices of the Passion and Blessed Sacrament.

X. The Roman Ritual may be followed, even though differing in certain particulars from the special ritual in use in the diocese.

XI. When the Communion is administered out of Mass, the “O Sacrum Convivium” may be omitted, but the Versicles and prayer are to be said.

The Blessing is to be given, except when Communion is given immediately before or after a Requiem Mass.

XII. The clergy, with the exception of Canons, are to genuflect to the high Altar in course of a Function.

Dubium I. Missa votiva de SS. Corde Iesu, quae ex Decreto S. R. C. diei 28 Iunii 1889 celebrari permittitur feria VI, quae est

in calendis cuiuscunque mensis vel eas sequitur, debetne esse sollemnis seu cantata, vel potest etiam esse privata, ut in duplicibus, cum *Gloria*, oratione unica et *Credo* ad tramitem decreti citati?

Dubium II. Si anniversarium consecrationis Episcopi dioecessani, quotannis impediatur festo dupl. I. cl., quaeritur an Missam et Commemorationem dicti anniversarii, tali in casu anticipare vel transferre liceat, quia secus semper et quotannis omitterentur?

Dubium III. Missa sollemnis vel cantata de anniversario electionis seu creationis Summi Pontificis regnantis, vel consecrationis Episcopi dioecessani, debetne etiam extra ecclesiam cathedralen et collegiatam celebrari, praesertim supposito quod plures ibidem celebrentur Missae?

Dubium VI. Rubricam Missalis (Tit. VI, n. 1) non usquequaque claram, auctores et professores Liturgiae sacrae interpretantes docent, ultimum evangelium in fine Missae, eodem prorsus modo dicendum esse prout primum, i.e. Sacerdote *oblique* stante, sive parum per suam sinistram converso ad populum. Cum tamen alii, praesertim seniores Sacerdotes negent talem esse sensum huius rubricae, quaeritur, utrum ultimum evangelium a Sacerdote *oblique* stante recitari debeat?

Dubium VII. Officium vot. de Immaculata Concep. B. M. V. in nonnullis dioecesibus Hungariae, hodie adhuc ex concessione Benedicti PP. XIII diei 15 Dec. 1717 ritu duplici recitari solet, quaeritur an diebus his Sabbati liceat celebrare Missam privatam de Requie. Ratio dubitandi est, quia officium est quidem duplex, sed votivum.

Dubium VIII. Recitans privatim officium aliquod votivum feriis Quirag., Quatuor tempor. aut vigiliarum, potestne celebrare Missam de feria in colore violaceo? Et si affirmative, debetne omittere commemorationem officii votivi illa feria privatim recitati?

Dubium IX. Commemoratio de Cruce, quae dicitur tempore Paschali, loco suffragiorum de Sanctis, iuxta Decretum S. R. C. 29 April. 1887 in Emeriten. omittenda est in offic. votiv. de Passione, an eadem omittenda est, ratione identitatis mysterii, etiam in officio de SS. Euch. Sacramento?

Dubium X. Rituale Romanum licetne ubique adhibere et in quibuscunque functionibus, etiamsi proprium Rituale dioecesanum in nonnullis tantum a Romano discrepans, habeatur?

Dubium XI. Rituale Romanum optioni administrantis S. Communionem relinquit, utrum antiphonam *O sacrum concivium* etc., recitare velit nec ne; sed ex rubrica erui non potest, num

versiculi et Oratio (Deus qui nobis) sint etiam ad libitum vel omnino de praecepto; et si affirmative ad secundam partem, quaeritur, utrum benedictio manu dextra et adhibita formula: *Et benedictio* etc., semper sit clargienda, quando citra Missam administratur S. Communio.

Dubium XII. Quum a Caereimoniali Episcoporum praescribatur ut omnes, exceptis Canonicis eccl. Cathedral., unicum genu flectant Cruci Altaris maioris, quaestio exorta est, utrum haec genuflexio facienda sit etiam in aliis ecclesiis seu cappellis publicis, ubi in altari maiori haud asservatur SS. Euch. Sacramentum?

Ad dubium I. Quoad primam partem, *Negative*; quoad secundam detur Decretum in una *Montis Politiani* 20 Maii 1890.

Ad II. Transferatur in primam sequentem diem non impeditam.

Ad III. *Negative*.

Ad VI. *Affirmative*.

Ad VII. *Affirmative*, et detur Decretum in *Bergomen*. 24 Novembris 1691.

Ad VIII. *Affirmative*, ad primam partem: *Negative* ad secundam (2).

Ad IX et X. *Affirmative*.

Ad XI. Versiculi, et oratio *Deus qui nobis*, sunt de praecepto: benedictio autem semper danda est, unico excepto casu, quando datur immediate ante vel post Missam defunctorum, sub formula *Benedictio Dei* etc.

Ad XII. *Affirmative*, sed in actu functionis tantum.

#### SUMMARY.

I. In concurrence of the Feast of the Sacred Heart with the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, the second Vespers will be of St. John with a commemoration of the Sacred Heart which is to be celebrated on the next day.

II. In concurrence of the Feast of the Annunciation of the B. V. M. with the Feast of the Five Wounds, the latter is to be transferred to the next day, if available; otherwise to the first free day in Lent.

V. The Feast of the Patronage of the B. V. M., fixed for the third Sunday of November, if hindered, is not to be transferred without a special privilege, but omitted.

Dubium I. Cum interdum (*v.g.*, 1892) festa SS. Cordis Iesu et S. Ioann. Bapt. simul eadem die concurrant, et iuxta Decretum

Urbis et Orbis diei 28 Jun. 1889, hoc in casu illud SS. Cordis in diem proximam 25 Junii sit transferendum, quaeritur: quomodo ordinandae sint secundae Vesperae in festo S. Ioann. Bapt., nonne totum erit de sequenti SS. Corde, cum commemoratione praecedentis S. Ioannis Bapt.?

Dubium II. Quum festum Annunc. B. M. V. incidit in fer. VI. post Dom. III Quadrag., cui feriae pro aliquibus locis affixum est offic. SS. Quinque Vulnerum D. N. I. C., officium hoc potest transferri in feriam sequentem, quae est Sabbatum, an vero debet omitti?

Dubium V. Si festum Patrocinii B. M. V. Dom. III Novembr. affixum, impediatur Octava Omnium Sanctorum vel alio festo altioris ritus, postne sine speciali indulto transferri, vel potius debet iuxta alias Decreta omitti?

Ad I. Vesperae erunt de Nativitate S. Ioannis Baptistae cum commemoratione de sequenti, iuxta Decretum in una *Dubii* die 5 Septembris 1891.

Ad II. *Affirmative*, Si Sabbatum est dies libera; secus ad alium diem intra Quadragesimam, quae si non suppetat, omittatur.

Ad V. *Negative* ad primum, *Affirmative* ad secundum.

## Notices of Books.

THIRTY-TWO INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY AND FOR THE FEASTS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. From the French, by Rev. Thomas F. Ward. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

As the translator says in his introduction:—"From time to time we have heard it regretfully asserted that books of devotion were not sufficiently numerous among us . . . this statement . . . applies particularly to books of devotion which have for their object the increase of knowledge and love for our blessed Mother." In publishing this book of Instructions, Father Ward has aimed at supplying this deficiency, and, we think, he has succeeded very well. As these Instructions are practical, sound, and free from all sentimentalism, we trust that they may prove useful both to the clergy, when preparing their instructions, and to the laity in fostering devotion to the Mother of God. The volume is, indeed, a good instructive book to read at any time, but is specially suitable for the month of May.

B.



**SERVITE MANUAL.** A Collection of Devotions chiefly in honour of Our Lady of Dolours. Compiled by the Servite Fathers. London: Burns and Oates, Limited. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

MOST of the Religious Orders have their special "Manuals," and we now have one compiled by the Servite Fathers. The devotions in this neat little volume are principally in honour of Our Lady of Dolours, and some of them are very beautiful. Then there are septenaries in honour of several Servite saints, and there is also an interesting account of the origin of the Servite Order. The Manual ought to be useful to all the faithful, and particularly to those frequenting the churches of the Servite Fathers.

W. F. B.

**TRUE WAYSIDE TALES.** Fourth Series. By Lady Herbert. London: Burns and Oates, Limited. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

IN this volume—the fourth of a Series of true tales—we find many that are both instructive and interesting. The volume commences with a history of the persecution of the Catholics in Russia, and at the end of this account we have prayers for the conversion of Russia to the true faith. In *Ada* and *The History of a Drowning Girl*, we have interesting accounts of conversions to Catholicity. Indeed all the tales are interesting, and the volume, which is very neatly got up, ought to be very popular and have a wide circulation among the Catholic youth of both sexes.

W.

**MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE.** By the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. 1892.

THIS beautiful booklet—beautiful, not merely by reason of the style in which it has been brought out, but especially by reason of its subject-matter—contains fifty short "Visits" to the Most Holy Sacrament. The thoughts are simple, natural, and affecting, and are expressed with that gracefulness which characterize everything that comes from Father Russell's pen. "How blessed a thing it must be," he writes in one of these short "Visits," "to have any share, however slight, in helping any soul to spend better any of its moments before the tabernacle!" This blessedness will surely be his.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

MARCH, 1893.

---

## ST. FRIDOLIN OF SECKINGEN.

SECKINGEN is a small town, of about four thousand inhabitants, on the German side of the Rhine, between Biele and Schaltheusen. It is very beautifully situated on a little spot which was once an island, but which, on account of a change in the river's course, is now joined to the mainland on the north. The rich meadows and green fields of the surrounding country are enclosed by blooming hedges, and relieved by the splendid oak and pine trees, which, in diminishing numbers, but ever-increasing verdure and development, extend from the Black Forest to the neighbourhood of the Rhine. The banks of the river are immediately protected by a line of tall and rustling poplars which, when mirrored here in the greenish tide beneath, look more than twice their natural size. Between them clumps of stunted fir and silver willow descend to the water's edge, and the cultivated in the summer time by varieties of the wood-sparrow and the finch, whilst they afford a still more welcome retreat in the frosts of winter to the coot and the swan-geese. Along the Swiss border, on the other side, the country is somewhat plain and monotonous: but a short way inland it becomes wonderfully varied and pleasant. Indeed, nature seems to have compensated the inhabitants of Switzerland for the bareness of so large a surface, and the awe-inspiring influence of the mountains, by giving additional fruitfulness and beauty to the low-lying cultivated districts, and to their quaint and homely cottages and farm-houses. Here heavy cattle, for the most part black and

tethered, graze in pastures that recall the fields of Normandy or Meath, and the green slopes in the distance are dotted with white sheep, whilst patches of yellow corn are scattered over the hollows, or disposed, with the regularity of sunbeams, along the hill-sides. It is in the midst of such surroundings that Seckingen is built. It is a prosperous and thriving little town. The great Rhine, still fresh from the impetus it has received at the falls of Neuhausen, flows by it with a strong and sweeping current. Its houses are all neat and tidy. Sprigs of weld and myositis flourish on the window-sills, and the walls display a profusion of luxuriant creepers, roses, vines, and clinging peach-trees. It is one of the blessings of the smaller towns of Germany that their inhabitants do not depend for existence on agriculture alone, no matter how fertile the soil may be around them. They have, as a rule, industries of some kind to maintain them in comparative respectability and comfort. In this respect Seckingen is not an exception. It has a large number of hands occupied at the manufacture of scarfs, silk ribbons, farm implements, gun, elastic, tobacco, and especially at cotton-weaving and wood-carving.

But close attention to the duties of life does not prevent the good folk of Seckingen from being exceedingly sprightly and spiritual in every sense. They are Catholics in the great majority, and stick to the old faith with extraordinary earnestness and intelligence. They are likewise social and friendly neighbours, and often when the day's work is over, they assemble in their pleasant gardens in summer, or in the comfortable halls and verandahs of their coffee-houses in winter; and there, in family or friendly groups, when current topics are disposed of, they relate, in the most earnest fashion, terrible stories of haunted houses, hair-breadth escapes, unearthly appearances of ghosts and shadows, the contentions of the great families in their neighbourhood in the olden times, of their own old castles of Schönan and Harpolinger, with the neighbouring castles of Laufenburg and Bärenfels. From tales of this kind, often more legendary than historic, they easily pass to stories of personal experience, representing the grotesque characters of distant

villages, and the curious places they have seen, like those described in the *Volk's-Kalendar*. Hence Seckingen has become a fruitful centre of legend, of folk-lore, and of poetry. It has gained far more than usual celebrity for a town of its size in the German Fatherland, and in the Swiss cantons of the north. Poets and novelists, historians and archaeologists, authors of fable and village tales, have equally contributed to its fame, and all without exception have ever a kindly word to say of the good St. Fridolin, whose name is inseparably connected with Seckingen, and whose memory is still revered by its inhabitants, as the founder of their happy and prosperous town, its first citizen, and greatest benefactor. Thus Berthold Auerbach, author of the *Schwartzwälder Dorfgeschichten*, and H. von Kleist, well known for his *Life of the Highwayman Kohlhaas*, have drawn several of their characters from the city of St. Fridolin; whilst Heinrich Pestalozzi, the author of *Liehard und Gertrude*, and Jeremias Gotthelf, the story teller of the Bernese Oberland, draw freely from the same abundant source.

In poetry, Seckingen and its saint are even still more popular. The Lutheran pastor, Hebel, the " Burns " of the Grand Duchy of Baden, vies with the celebrated Catholic poet, Schenkendorf, in doing honour to St. Fridolin. Short but elegant poems in praise of the saint have also been composed by Rudolph Wys and the famous Wurtemberg poet, Gustav Schwab, author of the *Knight of the Bodensee*. It must be said however, that the poet who has done most for Seckingen, and who has spoken of St. Fridolin and of his native Ireland<sup>1</sup> with the fullest acknowledgment, is Joseph Viktor von Scheffel. For Seckingen, Waldshut, Radolfzell, and this part of the Rhine, Scheffel has done almost as much as Walter Scott for the Border Burghs, and for the Tweed and Yarrow. No wonder, therefore, that his monument should be one of the most prominent objects at Seckingen itself, and that his statue should also be seen on the terrace of Heidelberg Castle; for scarcely one of the *alumni* of the old

<sup>1</sup> Es sind die alten Keltischen Leute von Erin, der grünen Insel und die Schiffe in trägt der frommen Gläubigen haben Fridolinus. — *Der Teufel's in Seckingen* (page 51).



university town did more for the popularity of his *Alma Mater* than the author of the song which its students now have made their own, and sing all over Germany.

“ Alt Heideberg, du feine,  
Du Stadt an Ehren reich  
Am Neckar und am Rheine  
Kein andre kommt dir gleich.”

It was at his retreat at Capri, in Italy, that Scheffel composed his greatest work, *Der Trompeter von Säckingen*. The hero of this poem, young Werner, at first a student at Heidelberg, is placed at an early period under the patronage of St. Fridolin.

“ In Säckingen ist ein guter  
Schutzpatron für junge Leute,  
Ist der Heilige Fridolinus,  
Morgen ist der Heiligen Festtag  
Der hat keinem noch verlassen  
Der um Hilf ihn bittend angiehet :  
Wendet euch an Fridolinum.”<sup>1</sup>

The poet then describes the scene which presented itself to Werner when he first arrived at Seckingen more than two centuries ago—a sight which may still be witnessed, in its main features, on the 6th of March, or the Sunday which follows it, as regularly as the years come round :—

“ The sun of spring shone brightly over the little town of Fridolinus. In joyful tones the organ played, and sent its rich notes far beyond the walls of the Münster. Werner hastens to put up his horse, and proceeds to the market-place, which he reaches just as the procession begins to stream through the great portal of the church. First comes the crucifix, borne by the deacon, with acolytes on either side ; then a troop of merry boys, kept in order by their aged and serious schoolmaster ; next come the maidens, dressed in white, and then the town—the congregation follow. Twelve youths bear the shrine of the saint adorned with gold and silver, and bedecked with flowers. Immediately behind it are the burgomaster and his councillors with tapers in their hands, the magistrate, the syndic, the notary, the doctor. Even the aged forester-in-chief is there ; for although he usually says his prayers in the woods, and does not stand on a very favourable footing with churches and processions, still he loves St. Fridolin, and would not be absent from his festival. The nobleman too is there, the haughty old Baron of Schönau, now stiff and broken, limping his way at a function he never missed.

Beside him is the spouse, who never yet refused charity to the beggar nor consolation to the afflicted; and around them are the young family, who have already learned the ways of happiness through faith and benevolence. Finally come the clergy, in due precedence, and vested according to their rank. With one voice and with one heart the whole company sing the praises of Fridolin, 'the strong saint,' 'the brave apostle,' and ask him to look down from heaven on their homes and families, to protect for ever their little town, and, above all, to guard them against war and pestilence:—

• Der du hoch im Himmel wohnest,  
Sehne gnädig auf dein Stadtlein,  
Schliess es gnädig in's gebet ein  
Fridoline, Fridoline.

Leih' auch ferner deinen Schutz uns,  
Wolle gnädig vor Gefahren,  
Krieg und pestilenz uns wahren.  
Fridoline, Fridoline.<sup>1</sup>

A number of knights of the old Teutonic Order 'Commenthur und Rittersmänner'<sup>2</sup> clad in Spanish mantles, with white crosses on their breasts, have arrived from their headquarters at Bickheim Castle, and advance to receive the procession at the walls of the great convent founded by St. Fridolin, the first erected for women on German soil. An orator then addressing the crowd delivers the panegyric of the saint, after which all return to chant the *Te Deum* in the church."

The description of this impressive scene leads the author to give a short account in verse of the saint's life, and several of the passages in this part of his poem are uncommonly beautiful. Thus he makes the saint address his native Ireland when he is about to leave it for ever:—

"Lass die klag, herzliebe Mutter,  
Nicht mit schwert und nicht mit Streitaxt  
Darf der Sohn sich Ruhm erstreiten.  
Andre zeiten, andre Waffen.

Glaub und lieb sind meine wehre  
Meinem Heiland tren ergeben  
Muss ich zu den Heiden ziehen  
Keltisch Blut treibt in die ferne.

Und im Traum hab' ich erschaut  
Fremdes Land und fremde Berge,  
Jungen Strom mit grüner Insel.  
War so schön fast wie die Heimath."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Page 60.

<sup>2</sup> This Order was established in honour of the Blessed Virgin in the year 1218, by a Thurgovian nobleman named Ulrich von Liebenberg.

And, again, when speaking of St. Fridolin's dream of this island in a great river, which was to replace for him the "holy island" in which he was prepared for his mission, the author indulges in the following reflections:—

“ Wohl ein Mancher von uns andern  
 Spät gebornen Menschenkindern  
 Traümt von einem stillen Eiland  
 Wo sich glücklich liesse nisten,  
 Und das müde Herz sich labt an  
 Waldes ruh und Sonntags Frieden  
 Und ein Mancher zieht sehnsüchtig  
 Auf die Fahrt—doch wenn sein Fuss sich .  
 Am erträumten Lande wäht  
 Weicht es jäh vor ihm zurücke  
 Wie im Süd das wundersame  
 Spiegelbild der Fee Morgana.”

But to come to more serious authors—a great number of historians have dealt with the life of St. Fridolin. The oldest biography of the saint that now exists was written by a monk named Baltherus, of the old Abbey of Seckingen, towards the end of the eleventh century. The annals of Seckingen had been destroyed during the invasion of the Hungarians, in 938; but a century later a manuscript life of the saint was preserved at the monastery of Eller, near the Moselle, which Fridolin himself had founded. Balther asked to be allowed to take this manuscript with him to Seckingen, but the prior refused to part with it; and, as there was neither ink nor parchment at hand, Balther could only set to work to study the subject-matter of the life, which he afterwards committed to writing at Seckingen itself. The previous accounts of the saint having entirely disappeared, this work has alone survived, and is the foundation of all that has since been written about St. Fridolin. Towards the middle of the sixteenth century a very interesting life of the saint was composed by the Blessed Peter Canisius,<sup>1</sup> who lived for many years at Seckingen. In recent times

<sup>1</sup> *Wahrhaftige Histori von dem Berühmten S. Fridolino, und Seinem Wunderbarlichen thaten auss vielen alten Scribenten zusammen gezogen, jetzunder aber auffis new gebessert und in Druck verfertigt, Durch Petrum Canisium Theologum, Societatis Jesu. Freiburg in Deutschland. Abraham Semperlin, 1589.*

a life of the saint has been published by Joseph Schuler,<sup>1</sup> pastor of Kaiserstuhl, near Seckingen, and another by Canon Heinrich Leo, of the Cathedral of Freiburg, in Breisgau. Many other writers<sup>2</sup> have occupied themselves with the Life and labours of Fridolin, and particularly in recent times a host of archæologists in Germany and Switzerland have discussed his origin, the date of his arrival in Germany, his labours in Lorraine and in the Canton of Glaris, and finally his settlement and work at Seckingen itself. Foremost amongst these are Dr. Franz Xavier Kraus, Professor of Church History at the University of Freiburg, in *Die Kunstweiler des Grossherzogthums Baden*;<sup>3</sup> Dr. E. Mone, in his *Urgeschichte des Badischen Landes*, and *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheines*; Ebrard, in the *Iro-Schottische Missionskirchen*;<sup>4</sup> Clement Schaubinger, in his *Geschichte des Stiftes Säckingen und seiner Begründers, des Hl. Fridolin*; Joseph Bader, in *Säckingen's Schicksale in kurzen Zügen geschildert*;<sup>5</sup> H. Ders., in *Das Münster S. Fridolin's zu Säckingen, nebst Geschichtl. Nothwehr über die Echtheit der Reliquien der Heiligen*; Dr. Meyer von Knonau of Zurich,<sup>6</sup> in *Mittheilungen der Züricher Antiquariatsgesellschaft*; Professor H. von Liebenau of Zurich, in *Lebensgeschichte der Königin Agnes von Ungarn*;<sup>7</sup> Hochenbaum van der Meer, in *Geschichte des Fürstlichen Freiadeligen Stiftes Säckingen*; Gelpke, in *Kirchengeschichte des Schwarzwaldes*; and, finally, Alois Lutolf, in *Die Glaubensboten der Schwyz vor St. Gallus*.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *St. Fridolin, Sein Leben und seine Verehrung, dargestellt von Joseph Schuler, Seckingen*. Hermann Strass, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> Amongst others, Goldast, *Rerum Alemannicarum Scriptores*; Gerebertus, *Historia Nigric Silvæ*; Neugart, *Episcopatus Constantiensis*; The Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum*, March 1st and 6th; Mabillon, *Annales Ord. St. Benedicti*; Eichorn, *Episcopatus Curicus*; Murer, *Heb. tin. Sancta*; Hefele, *Entstehung des Christenthums im Südwestlichen Deutschland*; Hergenrother, Friederich, Rettberg, Hauck in their *Kirchengeschichten*; Brusch, *Circumlegia Monasteriorum Germaniæ*; Ozanam, *La Civilisation Chrétienne chez les Français*; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*.

<sup>3</sup> *And Säckingen*, pages 45, 46.

<sup>4</sup> Page 285.

<sup>5</sup> Pages 202, 222.

<sup>6</sup> Also *Deutsche Biographie*, vol. vii., page 385.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. i., page 192.

<sup>8</sup> Pages 6, 267.



We cannot dwell on the many points of local interest which these living writers have raised in reference to St. Fridolin. They all agree that he was a native of Ireland,<sup>1</sup> but they are divided as to the exact date of his arrival in Germany. The majority, judging from the local materials at their disposal, firmly support the contention of the Bollandists that St. Fridolin came to France in the reign of Clovis I., and settled at Seckingen early in the sixth century. A few, however, follow the theory first put forward by Gerebertus, Abbot of St. Blasien,<sup>2</sup> that the date of Fridolin's arrival was considerably later, and that the Clovis mentioned by Baltherus was probably the second or third king of that name. Although this contention is supported by Dr. Tanigan, we confess that the earlier theory seems to us more probable. There are, no doubt, serious difficulties on both sides, but it appears to us that there are less in attributing the saint's apostolate to the reign of Clovis I. than to any subsequent period. It tallies much better than the later date with the annals of Poitiers, and the accounts which exist of the translation of the relics of St. Hilary effected by St. Fridolin. It is also far more in accord with the archaeological testimony of the Churches of Glaris, and of the remains of the old monastery at Seckingen, and, above all, with the immemorial tradition of the localities in which St. Fridolin chiefly laboured. This tradition is

<sup>1</sup> Baltherus says:—"Beatus Fridolinus ab extremis partibus inferioris Scotiae oriundus esse non ambigitur, quae videlicet apud ipsos Scotigenas Hibernia nuncupata adusque oceanum protendit suae amplitudinis confinia."

The Blessed Peter Canisius writes:—"Es verglichen sich die alten Historischreiber das unser Fridolinus nicht aus geringem und verächtlichem Geschlecht geboren, sondern sein herkommen von hohen edlen und königlichen stammen genommen habe aus dem *Niedern Schottland*, Hibernia genannt, an England gelegen. Daraus dan folget das im am gelt, gut, leut, land und allen zeitlichen dingen nicht abgangen were, &c." *Des Heiligen Fridolini Bichtigers Histori*, pp. 3, 4.

Even our learned and hospitable friend, Dr. Kraus, of Freiburg University, writes:—"Die Anfänge Seckingens werden auf die Missionsthätigkeit des *Irishen* Monches Fridolin Zurückgeführt." *Am St. Seckingen*, p. 45.

Joseph Schuler, in his *Sankt Fridolin Sein Leben und Seine Verklärung*, page 57, writes:—"Der Heilige Fridolin stammt aus Irland und ist Der Sohn reichen Eltern aus dem höchsten seiner Heimath."

<sup>2</sup> *Historia Nigrae Silvae, Coloniae*, 1783.

attested by Johan Stumpf,<sup>2</sup> author of one of the most valuable historical chronicles of Switzerland, published in 1568; by Egidius Tschudi,<sup>3</sup> in his work, *De Prisca ac vera Alpina Rhetia* (1538), and by the breviary of Basle of 1584.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, when, in 1637, the shrine of St. Fridolin was officially opened and examined by Franz Karl-Brandenburg, Canon of Seckingen, a document was found in it drawn up and signed, in 1357, by the Grand Duke Rudolf, eldest son of Albrecht of Austria, which stated that for close on nine hundred years previous to this the shrine had not been opened.<sup>4</sup> This could only be understood on the supposition that the Clovis under whom Fridolin acquired the island of Seckingen was in reality the first king of that name, the monarch who attributed his success to the God of Clotilde, who, by his victory at Zulpich, or Tolbiac, in 496, acquired dominion over Allmania, and ten years later routed the Arian Goths of Austrasia on the field of Voelade, not far from Poitiers. The other kings of the same name were mere boys, and would not answer in any way to the description of the Clovis of Balthar. Much more difficulty arises in the case of this contention on the Irish than on the German side; but we think it not impossible that Fridolin should have been prepared for his work, and ready to preach at the end of the fifth century. He was of noble descent, and had, probably, advantages of education that were not common in his time. His people were, no doubt, like most of their class in these days, enterprising and adventurous, and these qualities the young churchman turned to good account.

Very little is known of St. Fridolin's life in Ireland

<sup>2</sup> Bei Zeyten Clodovei Königs zu Frankreich und das jar Christi 492 hat St. Fridolin gewohnt in Burgundia und Helvetia und daselbst das wort Gottes verkündet. *S. Balthar's Chronik*, page 245.

<sup>3</sup> Anno Domini 825 venit Sanctus Fridolinus ad Episcopum Curiensem, tempore Ludovici primi Francorum regis qui etiam Clodoveus magnus vocatus est.

<sup>4</sup> "In Galliam ad Sanctum Hilariū Pictaviensem Episcopum profectus regis Gallorum Ludovici primi, quem et Clodoveum nominant, liberalitate et opera Pictavi, apud Belgas, utrope Mosellam, Argentinae, Curiae Rhaetorum atque per Burgundiam, Collegia aliquot per quae fides propagaretur, instituit: templa etiam multa ad divinum cultum extruxit."

<sup>5</sup> Schuler, *Sanct Fridolin*, page 43.

before he started for his mission. The part of the country to which he belonged is only a matter of conjecture. Dr. Lanigan is inclined to think that it was from some place towards the mouth of the Shannon, and whatever evidence exists would seem to point in the same direction. There is, however, nothing to warrant anything definite or sure, and it would be mere waste of time to enter into the discussion of a question so vague and uncertain. St. Fridolin's Latin biographer lays stress upon his great liberality, especially to the poor, whom he always met, "*gratulanda fronte*," with a smiling countenance and an open hand. From an early age he was instructed in literature and philosophy. He despised the sophistry of pagan theorists, whether they belonged to the school of Pythagoras or of Plato, and endeavoured by all the means in his power to gain the friendship of Him who is the fountain of all wisdom, that he might be his disciple in philosophy, faith, charity, and all the ways of religious life.<sup>1</sup>

In due course he was ordained a priest, and after he had laboured zealously in several places in Ireland, he resolved to go to foreign lands to preach the Gospel to the pagans. At first he crossed over to France, and went directly to the monastery of St. Hilary at Poitiers, where he was hospitably received. Here he remained for a considerable time, and the monks became so deeply impressed by the soundness of his doctrine, and the learning and energy with which he vindicated against the Arians the divinity of the Son, and the sublime prerogatives of the Mother, by his religious and mortified life, by his prudence and respect for authority, and at the same time by his gentle and considerate demeanour towards his brethren, that, in the course of some years, they chose him as their abbot.

<sup>1</sup> "Studiis litterarum postquam ab uberibus amatae nutricis et a emabulis flebilibus sejunctus est, sic acute inhaerebat, ut non tam materno lacte tenerae fragilitatis aetatem fulciret, quam ad sophiae mamillas suspensus, superno rore mentis vivacitatem obdularet: quia sui laudalibus sensus tenorem captionis argumentosisque sophisticorum sillogisticorum proloquiorum affectionibus implicare prorsus spernebat: nedum in aliquo pythagoricae, platonicaeque sapientiae posthumus haeres inconvenienter videretur, summae sapientiae sibi contubernatalem amicitiam ostendisse probaretur, sicut scriptum est. '*Omnis sapientia a Domino, Deo est.*'"  
*Vita Baltheri.*

How St. Hilary revealed to Fridolin the place where his body was concealed and his desire to have it transferred to another resting-place : how the Irish Abbot was honoured and loved by the local bishop, who took him to assist at his meeting with Clovis after the victory of Voelade; how the king remarked the earnestness and simplicity of the abbot in the midst of courtiers and attendants: all this is graphically related by Balther, who in all probability took it from the testimony of a contemporary witness. It is said that Clovis prepared a great banquet in honour of the bishop and clergy, and that many pagans were assembled at the feast. In the course of the service a large and precious wine-vessel<sup>1</sup> was broken, and the king playfully asked St. Fridolin to put it together by a miracle. Bending over it with fervour, the abbot uttered a short prayer, and at once restored the vessel to the king without any flaw or trace of the accident. Many nobles and soldiers who accompanied Clovis were converted by this act, and were baptized by the bishop before his return to Poitiers. St. Fridolin, having now obtained the approval of the bishop and the king for the translation of St. Hilary's relics, he proceeded at once to carry out the project, reserving, however, a portion of the precious treasure in his own

<sup>1</sup> "Ita enim inter porticulum quoddam vas lapideum vitrei coloris antequamque intraretur orationem preberet alteri plenum mero, contigit autem ut ipse prius idem vasculum acciperet postea benie Sancto Abbati, hoc vinum bibere nollit, proci-ret ad bibendum, et suis manibus, nescio quo casu, caderet in mensam, de mensae quoque scanno, per quatuor divideratur partes. Hoc facto, unus de pincernis quantocius potuit, istuc currens, collegit in unum particulas, deditque regi, Rex autem inde aliquantulum contristatus, magis propter recumbentium inspectionem quam vesculi perditionem, lactabundus tamen fronte dixit ad abbatem. Domine, causa tui amoris ad nihilum redactum est hoc vas. Scias ergo quid Deus inde per te faciat ad sui nominis laudem et honorem et ut quidam de istis recumbentibus qui adhuc spacio Sanctae Trinitatis fide, paganeo ritu idololatriis inserviunt, hoc capientes in Deum omnipotentem nobiscum credere non tardent. Tunc ille sanctus vir cantus et admonitus, atque suspensus pro sue omnis fragilitate cordetens extorquens, sed in Dei misericordia more solito confidens, recepit easdem quatuor portiones et sicut ipse docuit fractura, conjunxit in priorem statum fragmenta. At que vas idem ita junctum manibus amplexus parvum ad momentum innixus cernuo vultu brachiis super mensam orabatur ad Deum. Completæque citius oratione reddidit regi vas ita perfectum et reintignatum ut ab aliquo nec ipsius signum sive lineamentum fracturae agnosci posset."—*Vita Baltheri*.



possession for subsequent use. Soon again St. Hilary appeared to him, and urged him not to rest whilst so much ignorance and vice prevailed in the neighbouring countries, but to go on still further, and bring the name and knowledge of Christ into the woods of Allemania. He also told him of an island in the Rhine, which would be the final scene of his labours. Fridolin, therefore, notwithstanding the friendly protests and entreaties of his monks, again took up his pilgrim's staff, and made his way into Burgundy and Lorraine, taking with him a large quantity of the relics of St. Hilary. In these countries he built several churches in honour of his patron. He also founded a monastery on the banks of the Moselle, around which a little town grew up which in the annals is called Hilariacum, and is believed to be the modern town of Eller between Coblenz and Treves. He is likewise claimed by local archaeologists<sup>1</sup> as the founder of a monastery and church at St. Avoild, in the diocese of Metz, and not far from Gravelotte. Further south he built a church under the protection of St. Hilary at Strasburg, and another at Wasselonne, near Saverne, in Alsace. The name of Fridolin is still common amongst the people of these districts. We find it even in connection with this locality in one of Schiller's ballads so beautifully translated by our countryman Clarence Mangan:—

“ Ein frommer knecht war Fridolin  
Und in der furcht des Herrn  
Ergeben der Gebieterin  
Der Gräfin von Saverne.”

St. Fridolin, now crossing the Vosges Mountains, made his way through Burgundy into the Rhatian Alps, and fixed his residence for a while at Chur, where he was welcomed by the bishop, and where he also erected a church of St. Hilary. From Chur he went on many apostolic expeditions into the surrounding country, preaching the Gospel, and everywhere holding up St. Hilary, his guide and patron, as the model teacher, the champion of the orthodox faith, the scourge of

<sup>1</sup> *L'Histoire de St. Avoild et de ses Environs*, par Philippe Bronder, Metz, Typographie Nouvian, 1868.

the Arians, the determined foe of luxury and vice, the pillar of the Church, and the light of the faithful. So completely had Fridolin identified himself with St. Hilary that, wherever in these countries historians find any trace of a church or chapel dedicated to the great doctor of the Church, they conclude without hesitation that St. Fridolin must have exercised his apostolate there. The very name of St. Hilary became so familiar to the people, that they called a vast district of their country by his name, and that the name of the modern canton of Glaris (corrupted from Hilarius)<sup>1</sup> remains to this day a living and permanent testimony to the zeal of St. Fridolin, and to the persuasive methods by which he won the hearts of the wild race that then inhabited these rugged mountains. The Irish tourist who passes by Chur and the Via Mala on his way to Italy or the Engadine, may still see a vast district where the Cross was first planted by their countryman St. Fridolin. They may also discover that time has not diminished the veneration of the people for their apostle. In their religious life, after the names of God and of the Virgin, those of St. Fridolin and St. Hilary hold the first place. In the arms of the Canton of Glaris a figure of the Irish apostle is still emblazoned; and on old banners, medals, seals, and even clocks, the figure of a monk is often seen, with a pilgrim's staff and an abbot's cowl, and the words beneath tell us whom the figure represents:—

„Heiliger Herr Sankt Fridolin, unser getrauer lantzmann  
Hilf uns gut, ere, lutz und laud behaim.“

Processions are also frequent in the Canton of Glaris in honour of the saint. There is one in particular more historic than the rest, for it commemorates a great victory of the Confederates of Switzerland over their Austrian enemies. At the battle of Sempach, in 1386, the invader,

<sup>1</sup> „Dans le cours de cette histoire nous avons donné déjà l'étymologie du nom de Glaris. De Saint-Hilaire, en Latin, Hilarius, la prononciation générale a fait Glaris. Cette contrée est encore aussi simple qu'à l'époque où Saint-Fridolin, fondateur du Convent de Sackingen y vint prêcher le Christianisme." *Histoire et Description de la Suisse et de son Terr.*, par Philippe de Golbery.

Albert of Austria, was slain, and a great number of counts, barons, and soldiers killed or taken prisoners. The traitors of the town of Wesen who helped the invaders were then duly punished, and another victory at the battle of Naefels, two years later, put an end to Austrian domination in Switzerland. As a mark of gratitude for their signal success, the people of Glaris then vowed an annual procession in honour of the protectors who made them victorious in war, in spite of the superior numbers and discipline of their opponents—"In honour of the All-Powerful God, the Blessed Virgin, and the glorious princes of heaven, St. Fridolin and St. Hilary."

The historian Aegidius Tschudi gives a full description of this stirring episode, which a French writer justly compares with the vow of Morgarten, where the defenders of liberty swore "to die all for each and each for all," or with the historic oath of the Gruttli, where the three confederate leaders raised their hands to heaven, and vowed to the God who made emperors and peasants, that they wished no harm to the house of Hapsburg, but that the liberty they had received without restriction from their ancestors, they meant to transmit intact and pure to their descendants. Every year, on the anniversary of their victory, the people of Glaris assemble at Naefels; the names of fifty citizens who fell in the battle are proclaimed aloud, and the words of the original vow, which we give in French beneath, are repeated before the multitude.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Au nom de la très-sainte Trinité, Dieu le père, Dieu le fils et Dieu le Saint-Esprit, Amen. A celles fins que par nous graces soient rendues au Dieu tout puissant, à la Sainte Vierge Marie, aux glorieux princes du ciel Saint Fridolin et Saint Hilaire, nos fidèles défenseurs, et à toute l'armée céleste et de peur que le souvenir des grands secours et soulagemens que nous en avons reçu dans notre détresse ne se perde, ceci sera mis en écrit, d'autant que la mémoire et l'entendement de l'homme sont faibles et que dans la suite des temps on met bientôt en oubli les choses passées. . . . Malgré tous leurs efforts ces ennemis acharnés furent deconfits près de la Ranti, avec le secours du Dieu tout-puissant, de la Sainte Vierge Marie, de nos chers et fidèles soutiens dans la détresse Saint Fridolin et Saint Hilaire, et de toute l'armée des cieux; et les ennemis furent mis en grande deroute tellement que nous gagnâmes onze bannières et que nous tuâmes deux mille cinq cents hommes; quant a ceux qui se perdirent dans le lac et dans le Linth on ne pourrait en savoir le nombre. Et périrent aussi plusieurs de

Whilst thus labouring in the mountains of Glaris, St. Fridolin made many inquiries about his ultimate destination, the island in the great river which he had seen in his vision. He was informed that an island such as he described existed in the country to the north, and in that direction he was led in due course. No sooner did he come in sight of Seckingen, than he recognised his final home on earth. He entered it quietly and without attracting notice. The island was not then inhabited by any human being. It was merely used by the owners of the district as an enclosure for their cattle. They were alarmed, however, when they saw a stranger pacing their lands, and examining everything with the greatest care. They took him for a robber, who had probably crossed over from Austrasia to steal their herds; and they accordingly seized him, and would listen to no explanations, but scourged him cruelly, and drove him from the island. Fridolin, rejoicing to be thus treated like his Master, was determined to adopt the maxim of St. Paul—"Vincere in bono malum"—to conquer evil by charity. He returned several times to the island, but was more and more ill-treated, until at last he felt compelled to set out once more to the Court of France, and solicit from the king the right of fixing his residence on the island. The king not only granted this

ceux qu'on croyait être les auteurs du massacre des nôtres à Wesen. Et pour que par nous tous, les habitants du pays de Glaris, et par nos descendants, grâces soient à jamais rendues au Dieu tout puissant, à la Sainte Vierge Marie, aux glorieux princes du ciel St. Fridolin et Saint Hilaire, nos fidèles aides dans la nécessité et à tous les saints de Dieu, et pour qu'on n'oublie jamais les grands secours et reconforts que nous en avons reçus, nous, les habitants de Glaris, nous avons établi et nous établissons d'un commun accord, pour nous et pour nos descendants une procession dans toutes les églises de notre pays de sorte que de chaque maison le plus honorable personnage aille tous les ans, le second jeudi du mois d'Avril en grande dévotion par les chemins et sentiers où les nôtres ont enduré peine et labeur, jusqu'au moulin près des fontaines, et que cela se fasse avant tout à l'honneur et gloire de Dieu, de Notre Dame, de Saint Fridolin, de Saint Hilaire et de toute l'armée céleste, et ensuite pour le repos de toutes les âmes des nôtres qui ont perdu la vie en notre cause, lesquels braves gens ne faut jamais oublier; bien au contraire leur souvenir doit se garder à perpétuité. Au nom de Dieu et en témoignage public et digne de toi, nous les gens du pays de Glaris, en commun, nous avons fait apposer le sceau de notre pays à ce titre. Donné au mois d'Avril le vendredi avant Saint Ambroise 1389."—*Histoire de la Suisse*, par Philippe de Golbéry, page 340.



request, but made over to the saint by royal deed, the property of the whole island, and sent with him a guard to protect him, and, if necessary, to enforce his rights.

The difficulties that now beset the path of the missionary were sufficient to dishearten a less courageous and resolute apostle. Here he was, a stranger in a strange land, protected by the soldiers of a king whom the people regarded as a conquerer and a tyrant, having come, as they thought, to impose upon them the God of their enemies, the Franks, and to break the images of the pagan deities, which their fathers had worshipped in the woods and mountains, and which, from association, at all events, had long been endeared to them. But by prayer and patience the saint overcame all obstacles. His biographer frequently repeats how much he resembled his Divine Model in meekness and moderation of character. When, worn by anxiety and fatigue on his return to the island, he hung his wallet on the branches of a tree, and lay down to sleep beneath its shade, legend tells how the tree bent towards the earth, and pointed, as it were, to the ground beneath. The saint, on awaking, concluded that this was the spot on which he was to honour St. Hilary, by erecting a church to the glory of God under the protection of his patron. He then began his work, with the assistance of one man, who was friendly to him, and whose daughter he baptized. His genuine charity soon impressed his immediate neighbours. Those on the Swiss border were still turbulent, however, and contrived to annoy and harass the apostle by the most perverse means. The saint, in his difficulty, fasted and prayed, and at last threw himself on his knees, and begged of Almighty God to grant him peace for his ministry, and to confound his enemies. In answer to this prayer, the legend says that the course of the Rhine was changed, and made to intervene between him and his tormentors. Traces of the former bed of the river are still distinctly traceable to the north of the town, and the immediate change in the demeanour of the inhabitants is attributed to this miracle. From this forward the work of the missionary prospered without interruption. To assist him in building and endowing his church and convents, two

former friends of his, Arso and Landolph, noblemen of Glaris, made him a present of lands of great extent and value. When Arso died, however, his younger brother, Landolph, claimed these estates as part of his inheritance. To give the most absolute proof to the judges that the property had been made over to him and to his successors for ever, Fridolin is said to have raised Arso from the tomb to confirm the gift. Hence, in the church of Seckingen at the present day, the old Latin verses may be read in several places :—

“ *Praedia pro Domino, dant fratres haec Fridolino,  
Tempore post multo, negat alter fratre sepulto,  
Suscitât hunc dignus testem ducitque benignus  
Turba trimore tremît, sanctus sua jura redemit.*”

St. Fridolin now devoted himself with great energy to the establishment of his church, to the instruction and education of the young, and to all the other functions of the ministry. He won the people each day in greater numbers, and in order to ensure the permanency of his work, he founded two monasteries, one for men and another for nuns. For the direction of those who consecrated their lives to God in these establishments, he composed two treatises on Christian life in the cloister, which have unfortunately been lost. With this his life-work was complete. He had prepared and set in motion the means of salvation for many. To others a rich harvest was left to be reaped, but for him the eternal reward was ready, and troubled though his life had been, his death-bed was peaceful and precious in the eyes of the Lord.

From the Abbey of Seckingen the Christian faith soon spread far and wide into the fields and woods and mountains. Zealous missionaries were trained in the school of St. Fridelin, who walked in the footsteps of their founder, and renewed the face of the land around them. The treasures which its learned monks brought together there fared badly in later times, for their abbey was burned by the Hungarians in the tenth century, and again during the thirty years' war. The convent of nuns became even still more famous. It was one of the richest and most beneficent institutions in Germany for many centuries. Having been munificently endowed

in the feudal times it gave one of the first examples in Europe of that organized charity which acquired so great a development under the influence of the Church. The noblest families in the empire were represented amongst its abbesses and nuns. Many memorials of these devoted women exist still in Seckingen. Here, for instance, is the epitaph over the tomb of the Abbess Cunigunde, Countess of Geroldseck, who ruled the convent in the height of its success:—

“Hic Comitissa jacet Gerolotseggana, sacrati  
Istius Abbatissa loci Conigondis, honestis  
Moribus exornata adeoque illustris ut illam  
Tota jacens circum provincia semper amaret.  
Illa novem sacrae domui cum praefuit annis  
Utiliter, laudabiliter, prudenter, honeste  
Atque pie, ad patrii translata est gaudia coeli.  
Vivit ubi, aeterna fruiturque beata quiete.”

Similar inscriptions commemorate the lives of the Abbesses Agnes von Brandeis, Maria Kleopha von Castel, Clara von Hohenklingen, Maria Barbara von Liebenfels, Maria Regina von Ostein, Princess Agatha Hegezerin; and, finally, Anna Maria, Princess of Hornstein. The elaborate and costly shrine of St. Fridolin, now kept in the treasury of the church, is due to the devotion and zeal of the last-mentioned abbess, whose name it bears.<sup>1</sup>

The present church of St. Fridolin or Münster, as they call it in Seckingen, is a basilica with two renaissance towers. It has a fine choir and high altar with large pillars of stucco-marble on either side. The walls and ceiling are richly decorated in the ricocco style. The subjects in fresco

<sup>1</sup> “*Area Thaumaturgo Patri Patriae Fridolino erecta, largitate magna, concurrente gratioso capitulo, zeloso clero ac pia plebe, cura infatigabili principissae Mariae Annae de Hornstein.*” It was to one of the abbesses of Seckingen, Mariae Jakobica, Princess of Sulzbach, that the blessed Peter Canisius dedicated his *Life of St. Fridolin* in 1589. The frontispiece of this work represents figures of St. Hilary and St. Fridolin, and beneath the lines:—

“St. Hilarius ein Bishoff was,  
Zu Poitiers in Frankreich sass.  
Sanct Fridolin ein würdiger Abbt,  
Alt, weitherdaint, so hatt begabt  
Das Gotteshaus Seckingen am Rhein  
Daselbst Patron wirdt ewig sei n.”

represent the apotheosis of St. Fridolin, and scenes from his life and miracles. The people of Seckingen are good and faithful Catholics. An attempt was made after 1871 to force the Old Catholic schism upon them. A few families in the town joined the revolt, and the government of Baden actually handed over the parish church to this handful of dissenters. But the children of St. Fridolin would have nothing to say to these new theories or to the strange clergyman that came to enforce them. They went to the churches of the country around to satisfy their Sunday obligations, till the scandal of depriving a whole community of the rights of conscience became so absurd, that the church built by their forefathers, and hallowed by so many memories sacred to them, was restored to its rightful owners.

It was with no ordinary interest that we visited this church early last August, and were shown the treasures and relics of St. Fridolin by the present worthy and hospitable parish priest of Seckingen. He was occupied when we arrived there in preparing his children for the procession of the Feast of the Assumption, and we had the pleasure of listening also to the hymn of St. Fridolin, which is usually sung on such occasions:—

“ Danket allen Friedensboten,  
Die vom Heiland ausgesendet,  
Zu der Väter Hütten kamen,  
Friede bringend, Friede brachten!  
Dank St. Fridolin!

Solcher Wand'rer Stab wir küssen,  
Preisen segnend ihre Spuren,  
Die mit Muth und grossem Eifer  
Aus der Wildnis Gärten bauten;  
Preis St. Fridolin.

Deine Treue mit die Wahrheit  
Deine Liebe für die Menschen  
Und dein Barmherziges zum Tode  
Dass sie Alle rein beselen.  
Bitt' für uns, St. Fridolin!”

The German Guide-Book for the Black Forest<sup>1</sup> speaks

<sup>1</sup> “Das Fest des Hl. Fridolin, Sonntag nach dem sechs Mai, ist ein Volkstest des ganz Südl. Schwarzwaldes welches tausende von Besuchern vereinigt.”—*Neuester Schweizer Reise-Führer*, von C. W. Schmars, pag. 308.



of the procession of St. Fridolin's Day at Seckingen as one of the sights which is well worth seeing, and which brings together every year great crowds from the surrounding country. Many other churches, in honour of the saint, are likewise to be found in the small towns in the vicinity of Seckingen, at Walldkirch, at Stetten, at Kuchelbach-Birndorf, at Dietlingen, at Atzenbach, Oberampringen, Krotzingen, Ehrenstetten, Bremgarten, Neunburg-Lörrach, Zell-im-Wald, Herdern, Bettmaringen, Ittenthal, Bleichheim, Niederhof, Feldkirch bei Sulz.<sup>1</sup> Over all these towns and villages, and many besides, is spread the league or brotherhood of St. Fridolin, whose object is to keep alive the Catholic faith and the spirit of its first apostle in that country. This brotherhood, which was founded in the year 1519, and was approved by many Popes and richly indulgenced, received a fresh impulse and development in the present century through the exertions of the great Archbishop of Freiburg, Hermann von Vicari, by whose death, some twenty years ago, the Church lost one of the noblest characters and one of the most apostolic men of modern times. In the presence of the relics of St. Fridolin its members make profession of unalterable faith in the Blessed Trinity and in the Divinity of Jesus Christ: they offer the tribute of their love and gratitude to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and then solemnly declare<sup>2</sup> that henceforward they take as their "patron, their guardian, and their guide," the blessed and beloved Fridolin, whom they promise never to forsake, and ask to be with them through all the difficulties and hardships of life, and, above all, at the hour of death. All these things prove that St. Fridolin is not forgotten, that his work lasts, and that after fourteen centuries his spirit lives and his name is honoured.

Ireland may indeed feel proud of having sent from her

<sup>1</sup> "*Sankt Fridolin Sein Leben und Sein Verheeren.*"—Von Joseph Schuler.

<sup>2</sup> "O Wunderthatiger Diener Gottes und Fürbitter: Ich derer die dich lieben und anrufen, Heiliger, Fridolinus: ich elender und sündiger Mensch erwähle dich für heute und allezeit zu meinem besonderen Patron, Beschützer und Fürbitter," &c.

shores an apostle so true to his purpose, so learned, so mild, but, at the same time, so determined and so brave. For Fridolin was undoubtedly one of the great abbots, one of the men who laid the foundations in Europe of the new society, of the more perfect civilization, who went to the root of the vices of ignorance and luxury which had wrecked the pagan world, and who wrought a change that restored even to the helot and the land-man something of the primitive dignity and happiness which the Creator intended them to enjoy.

J. F. HOGAN.

---

### THE ETHNOLOGICAL TABLE OF MOSES.

THE most ancient and the most interesting record of the races of antiquity is that contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis. It is true that we find many of the races of mankind depicted with remarkable accuracy at Thebes, in the tomb of an Egyptian prince named Rekh-ma-Ra, who lived a century before the exodus. It is true also that much light has been shed, and is being shed every day, upon the science of ethnology by the discoveries that are being made among the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions and the hieroglyphics of Egypt; but it still remains an undoubted fact, that the tenth chapter of Genesis is the most precious treasure of the ethnologist, and that the development of modern science, whilst in some points supplementing and enlarging it, bears witness to the reliability and accuracy of what it contains.

There have not been wanting critics, however, to call in question the trustworthy-ness of the ethnographical table of Moses. Thus Colenso,<sup>1</sup> whilst good enough to admit that the nations in this chapter "are not, as some have supposed, in many cases, a mere fiction of his own (the writer's) imagination," still holds that the Jehovist, whom he regards

<sup>1</sup> *The Pentateuch*, pages 338-394.

as the author, gives evident signs of the limited geographical and ethnological knowledge of the time of Solomon, in which, so we are told, he lived, and that in some points "it is at variance with the ethnological science of the present day."

One thing certain is, that Colenso is not in line with the latest teaching of biblical criticism, as to the composition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, in holding it to be the work of the Jehovist. Dr. Driver, who sets forth the most recent conclusions of the "higher criticism,"<sup>1</sup> attributes, together with Kuenen<sup>2</sup> and Wellhausen, the scheme and groundwork of the chapter to the writer of the so-called *Priestly Code*, into which, he tells us, "notices of the nations descended from Noah, derived from the Jehovist, have been inserted by the final redactor." Naturally, we sympathise just as little with Dr. Driver's view as with that of Bishop Colenso; but we think it well to point out the bishop's weakness in matters of biblical science, since he poses throughout his work as a champion of the "higher criticism."

In a recent article, contributed to another periodical,<sup>3</sup> we pointed out that the presence of differences of style in the Pentateuch, is by no means inconsistent with the Mosaic authorship; and, for reasons therein assigned, we suggested that that portion of the Pentateuch known by modern critics as the *Priestly Code*, might perhaps be taken as the direct composition of Moses himself; the remaining passages having been incorporated by him in his work from pre-existing sources.

Applying this principle to the tenth chapter of Genesis, which modern "critics" are unanimous in declaring not to be a homogeneous composition, we find that vv. 1-7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32, are attributed to the writer of the *Priestly Code*. On examination it will be found that these verses constitute the framework of the whole chapter: that they set forth a complete table of the sons of Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and that the remaining verses are more or less in the form

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, page 13.

<sup>2</sup> *The Hexateuch*, page 67.

<sup>3</sup> *Dublin Review*.

of supplement. Thus vv. 8-12 introduce the episode respecting Nimrod: vv. 13-19 enter with great minuteness into the descendants of Mesraim and Chanaan, as do vv. 24-30 in regard to the Arab tribes. The 21st verse undoubtedly creates a difficulty, for there does not seem to be any sufficient reason for saying that Moses introduced such a section from an external source. But then many critics are doubtful about it,<sup>1</sup> and not indisposed to class it with those parts of the chapter which we consider to be the direct composition of Moses himself.

If, then, it be admitted that there are signs of different styles in the Pentateuch—on that matter we express no opinion—we may, perhaps, explain the fact by conceding that whilst Moses himself wrote a considerable part of it, he incorporated with his own composition certain passages taken from pre-existing written sources. But, be it understood, we are not laying down that the facts contained in this chapter—the substance of it, and indeed to some extent the form also—are not far anterior to the time of the great Hebrew patriarch. Colenso, no doubt, fixes the composition of the table at the time of Solomon, and many rationalistic interpreters bring down its final redaction to the days of the exile: but it is satisfactory to know that a great authority on primitive history and archaeology, and one whom we may be well content to follow in this matter, takes a very different view of the subject.

"In the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis [says M. Lenormant] Moses gives us a table of the nations known in his time as affiliated to the three great chiefs of the now race of post-diluvial humanity. This is the most ancient, the most precious, and the most complete document which we possess on the distribution of the ancient nations of the world. We may even consider it as anterior to Moses, for it represents nations in positions, which the Egyptian monuments show us to have been much changed in several important points before the time of the exodus. Moreover the enumeration is made there in regular geographical order, from Babylon and Chadda as a centre, not from Egypt or Palestine. It seems therefore probable that this table of the

<sup>1</sup> Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, 62, b. ii., page 276.

<sup>2</sup> *Manuel de l'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, vol. i., page 57.



nations and their origin was part of the tradition brought by the family of Abraham from Chaldaea, and that it represents the distribution of nations known to the civilized world at the time when the patriarch left the banks of the Euphrates; that is, about two thousand years before the Christian era."

So much we say in regard to the composition and literary form of the tenth chapter of Genesis. We now pass on to discuss the subject-matter of it. Professor A. J. Sayce is a man of whom it may be said with truth, that he has done good service in the field of biblical interpretation, both by his labours in the decipherment of the ancient inscriptions, and by his many publications on the history of the ancient peoples of the East. It is with regret, therefore, that we find ourselves constrained to differ from him in regard to the ethnological table of Genesis. Following the lead of M. Renan,<sup>1</sup> he had already laid down with respect to it that its arrangement, "is geographical, not ethnological, the peoples named in it being grouped together according to their geographical position, not according to their relationship in blood and language."<sup>2</sup> In his more recent work, *On the Races of the Old Testament*, he maintains, and argues in defence of the same view:—"The tenth chapter of Genesis," he says,<sup>3</sup> "is ethnographical rather than ethnological. . . . It is descriptive merely, and such races of men as fell within the horizon of the writer, are described from the point of view of the geographer, and not of the ethnologist. In Hebrew, as in other Semitic languages, the relation between a mother state to (*sic*) its colony, or of a town and country to its inhabitants, was expressed in a genealogical form." Finally:—"The three sons of Noah are each assigned a separate place of settlement—Japheth in the north, Ham in the south, and Shem in the centre; and are accordingly regarded as the fathers or ancestors of the nations and cities which occupied the regions belonging to them."

Professor Sayce considers it necessary to interpret the tenth chapter of Genesis in this way; otherwise it cannot be

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques*, pages 35 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, page 36.

<sup>3</sup> Page 39.

reconciled, he tells us, with modern research. The difficulties he raises on this score we shall have to consider later; two remarks we may, however, make at once: first, if the ethnological table of Genesis stood alone, much might, perhaps, be said in favour of Professor Sayce's explanation; though even in that case we see no sufficient reason for departing from the traditional view; but, seeing that we have the ethnological table repeated, almost in its entirety, amongst the genealogical tables of the First Book of Chronicles,<sup>1</sup> it is not easy to see how we are to refuse to interpret it as being something more than a mere geographical chart. Secondly, we are not disposed to attach much weight to the repetition of the name Sheba, in the chapter; though, apparently, Professor Sayce considers it to tell powerfully in favour of his contention. "In one case only," he says, "was it necessary to group the same tribe under different ancestors. The south Arabian tribe of Sheba spread far to the north, through the 'sandy' deserts of Havilah. . . . It is consequently named twice: once as a people of the south, under Ham; once as a people of the centre, under the head of Shem." In other words, Sheba occurs twice in the ethnological table, because part of it lay in the central, part in the southern zone. But then—on the supposition that Moses distinguished with such great nicety between the southern and central districts, and that we are dealing here with a mere geographical chart—how comes it, that whilst the Arabian tribe of Sheba is divided in two, Chanaan and the tribes derived from it are classed with the people of the south, though they would much more naturally have formed part of the central zone? As a matter of fact, the double appearance of the word Sheba in the table admits of a very simple explanation. The Cushite Sheba of verse 7 is quite distinct from the Hamite Sheba of verse 28; nor is there any reason to be sceptical, because we come across two tribes of different origin, bearing the same name. It is a phenomenon, not unfrequently encountered in history; and in fact, to take an instance from the ethnological table itself, many archaeologists

of distinction maintain that there is no connection whatever between the Chanaanite nation of the Hittites and the famous empire of antiquity, bearing the same name. Moreover, in the case of the two Shebas, the frequent and complicated movements of Cushites and Shemites in Arabia, in primitive times<sup>1</sup>—admitted by all historians—afford an obvious explanation why two tribes, which were perhaps brought into intimate and long-continued relations with one another, should have come to be known by the same name.<sup>2</sup>

We proceed now, without further introduction, to discuss the various nations set down in the ethnological table. We shall pass in review all the peoples that are named of the family of Japheth; but considerations of space make it necessary for us to confine ourselves to the more important descendants of Ham and Shem.

The sons of Japheth, we are told, were “Gomer and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Thubal, and Mosoch, and Thiras” (vs. 2). Gomer is the same as the Gimmirra of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Cimmerians of the Greek writers, who are mentioned by Homer in the *Odyssey* as dwelling in sunless obscurity.<sup>3</sup>

ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμος τε πόλις τε,  
 ἥρι καὶ ρεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδὲ ποτ' αὐτοῖς  
 Ἥελιος φαέθων καταδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν,  
 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νύξ ὀλοὴ τέταται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι.

They occupied the country north of the Euxine Sea, and have left a memorial of themselves in the name of the Crimea. Schöbel,<sup>4</sup> and other writers identify them with the Cimri, who were the terror of Europe in early times, and whom Marius, the famous Roman general, overthrew in the year 101 B.C.; and through them, with the modern Celts. On the other hand, Delitzsch holds<sup>5</sup> that “the Cimmerians

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Delitzsch, *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i., page 319.

<sup>2</sup> It will be observed that this paragraph does not take for granted that the names in chap. x. are merely those of the descendants of Noah. We might have replied to Professor Sayce that the two Shebas were merely the names of two men.

<sup>3</sup> xi. 14, &c.

<sup>4</sup> *L'authenticité mosaïque de la Genèse*, page 109.

<sup>5</sup> *Commentary*, page 308.

have disappeared, and left no trace behind except a few geographical names." It is true, no doubt, that the bulk of the Cimmerians seem to have been practically exterminated in war during the seventh century B.C., by the son and successor of Gyges, King of Lydia; but then, our knowledge of the history of nations in very early times is too fragmentary to enable us to say, what offshoots may have been sent out by the Cimmerians long before their encounter with the Lydian king. With our present knowledge, therefore, it seems impossible to decide whether we are to identify the Celts with the ancient Cimmerians or not.

Three sons are attributed to Gomer, "Asenecz, and Riphath, and Thogorma" (vs. 31). Asenecz is set down by many writers<sup>1</sup> as the ancestor of the Germans and Scandinavians.<sup>2</sup> In the prophecy of Jeremias (li. 27), the name is associated with Ararat and the Minni, and hence the people represented by it are supposed to have inhabited the parts of Asia Minor afterwards known as Phrygia, Bithynia, and Mysia; a conclusion rendered more likely by the fact that we meet with an Ascanian lode in Phrygia, an *Ascanium Flamen* in Bithynia, and that in Homer, *Ascanios* is the name of a Phrygian hero. "On Riphath," Sayce informs us,<sup>3</sup> "no light has yet been thrown by the decipherment of the records of the past." Josephus connects<sup>4</sup> it with the Paphlagonians; whilst in the *Cicillô*, Riphath is regarded as the ancestor of the Celts and Gauls, who, having first dwelt by the Carpathian mountains, afterwards migrated westwards, and settled in Gaul and Britain. Thogorma has always been held to be the ancestor of the Armenians and other peoples dwelling in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus. Delitzsch adopts this view,<sup>5</sup> and, identifying Thogorma with the Tilgarmi of the Assyrian inscriptions, writes as follows:—"The Armenian tradition is confirmed by Tilgarmumu being, in the Cuneiform inscriptions, the name of a fortified town in the subsequent

<sup>1</sup> Lamy, *Comm. on Genesis*, i., page 308.

<sup>2</sup> *Celtic Catalogue*, Feb., 1879, page 436.

<sup>3</sup> Delitzsch, *l.c.*, page 369.

<sup>4</sup> *Books of the Old Testament*, page 49.

<sup>5</sup> *Antiquities of the Jews*, Bk. i., c. vi.

*l.c.*



district of Melitene, on the south-western boundary of Armenia."

Magog was the second son of Japheth. The same word occurs twice in the prophet Ezechiel (xxxviii. 2 ; xxxix. 6), and from its use in the first passage, where Magog is said to be the land of Gog, Professor Sayce gives an original explanation of it. "Gog is," he says,<sup>1</sup> "the Gugu of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Gyges of the Greeks; and in Magog, therefore, we must see a little of Lydia"—taking Magog to be Mat-Gugu, or "Country of Gyges." This reasoning seems to us to rest on a very slender basis. The country of Lydia appears in another part of the ethnological table, and the traditional rendering seems here undoubtedly the right one. "Magog, in fact," as says Delitzsch,<sup>2</sup> "shows itself to be, as already stated by Josephus and Jerome, and as since Bochart universally accepted, a Hebrew common noun for that many-branched nomadic nation of northern Asia, called by the Persians, Saka (*Σάκαι*), and by the Greeks, Scythians." Modern orientalists generally agree in identifying the offspring of Magog with the great Turanian race, which in early times inhabited the vast and indeterminate regions of Scythia, and which embraces a large number of distinct nations and languages, having yet a certain relationship existing between them.

But then, it may be asked, if Magog was the ancestor of the great Turanian race, how comes it that he is mentioned among the family of Japheth? Why is the Turanian race associated with the Aryan or Indo-European nations? Let the following teaching of M. Lenormant suffice by way of reply. "The Turanian race," he says,<sup>3</sup> "is one of the oldest in the world, and appears to have migrated at the same time as the Hamitic; it might even be possible to restore the chief features of an epoch, when the sons of Turan and of Cush alone occupied the greater part of Europe and Asia, whilst the Shemites and the Aryans had not yet left the regions which were the cradle of our species."

<sup>1</sup> *L.c.*, page 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentary*, page 311.

*Manuel de l'Histoire Ancienne*, i., page 63.

M. Lenormant, moreover, lays down that the fundamental unity of the Turanian race is manifested both by ethnology and the science of language; that it seems to be a mixed race, intermediate between the yellow and the white; and finally, that there can be no doubt that, on one side, at least, it is allied to the stock of Japheth. "All appearance would lead us to regard the Turanian race as the first branch of the family of Japheth, which went forth into the world, and by that premature separation, by an isolated and antagonistic existence, took, or rather preserved, a completely distinct physiognomy."

There is no room for doubt in regard to Madai, the third son of Japheth. Madai is, in fact, the Mada of the Assyrians, corresponding with the Aryan nation of the Medes. The primitive abodes of the Aryans seem to have been Sogdiana and Bactriana, on the banks of the Oxus. In course of time, two large colonies, separating from the mother-country, went in search of new lands: one towards the south, the other towards the west. The former penetrated into India, and, having subjugated the Hamite and Turanian population, which they found in possession, laid the foundation of the Brahman civilization; the latter, having crossed the Caspian Sea, and the river Tigris, settled in the districts that afterwards received the names of Media and Persia.<sup>1</sup>

In regard to Javan, the fourth son of Japheth, Josephus gives us, as he does in most cases, the true interpretation. "From Javan," he says,<sup>2</sup> "Jonia and all the Grecians are derived." Such is the opinion of all interpreters, ancient and modern; for, in many ancient languages, words connected with the name Javan are employed to designate the Greek race. In the Indian code of Manu, the Greeks are called Javanas, in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, Junan; in the Persepolitan inscriptions, Juna; whilst in the triple inscription of Behistun, Greece is named Javanu; and, we may add, the modern Arabs give to the Greeks the name of Jonanÿun. From the coasts of Asia Minor, in early times

<sup>1</sup> *Civiltà, l. c.*, page 423.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiquities*, i. 6.

the Greeks seem to have spread themselves over the shores and islands of Aegean, Ionian, and Tyrrhenian Seas; developing, in historical ages, into the most renowned nation of antiquity.

To Javan four sons are attributed, "Elisa and Tharsis, Cetthim and Dodanim" (v. 4). According to Josephus,<sup>1</sup> Elisa was the ancestor of the Aeolians; others connect the name with the province of Elis in the Peloponnesus, strengthened in their opinion by the fact that a river named "*Ἐλισσα* flows through it." But there seems little doubt that the name Elisa really stands for European Hellas,<sup>2</sup> more especially the Peloponnesus. On the subject of Tharsis there has been much difference of opinion. Josephus identifies it with Tarsus in Cilicia; but, on the other hand, Delitzsch tells us that that colony "arose long after the period which the table represents." He suggests Tartessus in Spain; and to the objection that that was a Phœnician and not a Grecian colony, replies that we know from Herodotus (i. 168), that Phocians from the land of Hellas had settled there before the Phœnicians, and that it is this Hellenic colony that is referred to in the ethnological table.

Cetthim is one of those names on which Professor Sayce bases his argument for the merely geographical character of the tenth chapter of Genesis. "Kittim," he says,<sup>3</sup> "was Niton in Cyprus, the site of which is now occupied by Larnaka. It was, however, a Phœnician, and not a Greek settlement, a fact which strikingly illustrates the geographical character of the tenth chapter of Genesis." If Cetthim was a Phœnician colony, and is here set down among the sons of Javan, ancestor of the Greek race, how are we to defend the ethnological character of the table? The objection is not a new one. It had already been advanced—amongst others, by Colenso.<sup>4</sup> The fact is, it is quite true that Cetthim was a Phœnician colony, the most ancient of the Phœnician colonies

<sup>1</sup> *l. c.*

<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch, page 313.

<sup>3</sup> Lenormant, *Les Origines*, t. ii., pt. ii., page 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Races of the Old Testament*, page 47.

<sup>5</sup> *Pentateuch*, page 91.

in Cyprus; but it is also a fact, that the whole island, as well as the town of Kition, came to be known by the name Kettim or Cettim,<sup>1</sup> perhaps on account of the world-wide reputation of the city of that name. This was at a very remote period, and it seems clear that it is to the indigenous population of Cyprus, descended from Javan, and not to the Phœnician colonists, that the sacred writer refers: "It is by no means," as Delitzsch says,<sup>2</sup> "Cyprus as colonized by the Phœnicians, that is here intended by the genealogist." Finally, the fourth son of Javan is Dodanim, whom, perhaps, we are to connect with Dardania in Phrygia, perhaps with the people of Epirus, who have left a trace of their ancient descent in the name Dodona.<sup>3</sup> But most likely—owing to the similarity of the Hebrew letters *resch* and *daleth*—the word is a corruption for Rodanim; and in that case the inhabitants of the island of Rhodes, and of the other islands in the Aegean sea are undoubtedly referred to.

It is remarkable that the names of the fifth and sixth sons of Japheth—Thubal and Mosoch—constantly occur in conjunction in ancient documents. They are always associated in the Old Testament.<sup>4</sup> To the classical geographers they were known as the Tibareni and Moskhi, and they appear in the Assyrian inscriptions as Tubla and Muska. By Josephus the Tibareni are identified with the Iberes; not, as some have supposed, the early inhabitants of Spain, but a nation dwelling between Colchis, Albania, and Armenia, the ancestors of the present savage tribes inhabiting the valleys of the Caucasus; nor is there any reason for supposing him in error. As we should expect, the Moskhi are considered to have dwelt in the same neighbourhood. Josephus looked upon them as the original stock of the Cappadocians, amongst whom, he informs us, there "is even still a city called Mazaca."<sup>5</sup> The Moskhi originally occupied the regions of Pontus, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, and Cappadocia; and some modern writers<sup>6</sup>—apparently without solid

<sup>1</sup> *Le comte de. Les Origines*, pages 18-25.

<sup>2</sup> Page 311.

<sup>3</sup> *Cicilia, &c.*, page 121.

<sup>4</sup> Ez. xxvii. 13; xxxii. 26; xxxviii. 3; xxxix. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Antiquities*, i. 6.

<sup>6</sup> *e.g.*, Osann.



grounds—are inclined to connect them with the Muscovite people.

The last of the sons of Japheth, Thiras, is, to a great extent, shrouded in obscurity. Delitzsch connects the name with the inhabitants of the north-west of the Euxine Sea, through which the river Tyras flows. Lenormant<sup>1</sup> refers it to the Chetas, or Hittites, who dwelt originally in the south of Asia Minor. The opinion of Josephus who, in common with the great majority of interpreters, ancient and modern, regarded Thiras as the progenitor of the Thracians, seems to us to be the right one. "Thiras [says Lenormant]<sup>2</sup> can only be the ancestor of the Thracians. The Greek historians also have informed us that the Thracians came originally from Asia Minor; and that, having left Bithynia at some unknown epoch, they came across the Hellespont to seek a settlement in the countries to the north of Macedonia."

We have now completed our discussion of the family of Japheth, and so far we see no reason for departing from the ordinary interpretation of the ethnological table, or for considering it a mere geographical chart. Before entering upon the examination of the nations tracing their origin to Ham and Shem, it will be well to apprehend clearly that they cannot, in all cases, be so sharply distinguished, one from the other, as are the various members of the Japhethic stock. This is not because the author of the tenth chapter of Genesis is mistaken in his information, or that our knowledge of the early history of the Shemites and Hamites is less reliable; but, owing to the widespread migrations and movements of the children of Ham in primitive times. Perhaps we cannot do better than quote here an important passage from M. Lenormant upon the subject:—

"It seems certain [he says\*] that the Hamitic race inhabited at first a great part of Western and Southern Asia, before the arrival of the children of Shem, who drove them out from thence. Nimrod, a descendant of Cush, reigned in Babylon, built Erech and Calneh, in the land of Shinar, and established

<sup>1</sup> *Les Origines*, pages 249-259.

<sup>2</sup> *Manuel*, &c., page 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Manuel*, &c., page 58.

there the first of all empires. The Hamites were the first inhabitants of the country bordered by the Oxus, extending towards the upper course of the Indus, whence it derived the name Hindoo-Koosh, always given to the mountain chain in this region. All scholars are now agreed that the banks of the Tigris, Southern Persia, and part of India itself (where the tribes of this race were called *Kaukisasi*), were peopled by the Cushite family before being occupied by the descendants of Shem, and by the Aryans of the race of Japheth. There are also good reasons for believing that the Carians, the original inhabitants of a great part of Asia Minor, were of the race of Ham. And, lastly, the same race exercised in early times an uncontested sovereignty on the coasts of Carmania and Gedrosia, along the Indian Ocean, and all over the south of the Arabian Peninsula."

Bearing in mind the influence and widespread extension of the Hamitic race at a very remote epoch in the history of humanity, we proceed now to discuss the children of the two remaining sons of Noah. From Ham were descended, we learn (v. 6), "*Chus and Mesraim, and Phut and Chanaan.*" Chus, the eldest, Josephus says—and in this he is followed by all interpreters—was the father of the Ethiopians, who dwelt to the south of Egypt, towards Abyssinia.<sup>1</sup> The Cushites, as we have already seen, were widely spread over Asia, in early times; and of this fact the Bible gives us a remarkable confirmation in the passage relating to the famous hunter Nimrod, the son of Cush (vv. 8-12). "*The beginning of his kingdom was Babylon, and Arach, and Achad, and Chalamme, in the land of Senmaur*" (v. 10). Schrader and other rationalistic critics try, it is true, to prove that the passage has been inserted in the ethnological table owing to a confusion between the Ethiopian Cush and the Babylonian Kas. But, as Delitzsch shows, there is ample justification for the appearance of the passage in its present position. There was, in fact, we know, a Cush settled upon the Erythrean Sea and the Persian Gulf, whence southern Arabia and northern Africa was peopled; and which enriched Babylonia with a quasi-Egyptian culture. We know too that two Babylonian provinces were called *Meluha* and *Makan*, which are elsewhere the names of Ethiopia and Egypt;<sup>2</sup> and that the

<sup>1</sup> Delitzsch, page 315.

<sup>2</sup> *Paradise*, pages 56, 129-131.

Greek legend of Cepheus and Memnon brings into close relations the affairs of African Ethiopia and Central Asia. All this supplies strong confirmation of the early connection that existed between the family of Cush and the Babylonian cities. As for the cities themselves, named in the verse just quoted, Babylon requires no elucidation; Arach or Erech is known to be the Uruki of the inscriptions, the ruins of which still exist under the mounds of Warka, on the left bank of the Euphrates;<sup>1</sup> Achad, together with Sipar, formed the double town of Sepharvaim, north of Babel, on the Euphrates; whilst Chalanne is shown conclusively to have been the Kulunu of the native texts, which stood upon the ground occupied by Ctesiphon in later times.

"Out of that land," continues the sacred writer (v. 11), "came forth Assur, and built Ninive," &c. According to our view, these words do not convey the true meaning of the original text. We prefer, with Vigouroux and others,<sup>2</sup> to translate the Hebrew as follows: "And out of that land he (Nimrod) went forth into Assur, and built Ninive," &c. For by so rendering—and the Hebrew idiom is quite consistent with such a meaning—we bring the verse into perfect accord with the text. In the previous verse we have been told of the beginning of Nimrod's empire; in the next words we naturally look for an account of the development of his power; and as we translate them, they convey information precisely upon that point. Taking, therefore, the words to mean that Nimrod went forth from his Babylonian kingdom into Assyria, we find that, Hamite though he was, he subjected to his sway the Shemite inhabitants of that country, and built there the cities of Ninive, Chale, and Resen. The mounds of Konyunjik still mark the site of ancient Ninive; whilst the position of Chale is indicated by the mounds of Nimrod. Resen is noticeable chiefly on account of the remark made about it by the sacred writer: "This is the great city" (v. 11). For these words in themselves are a refutation of such critics as hold that the ethnological table

<sup>1</sup> Delitzsch and Sayce.

<sup>2</sup> Vigouroux, *La Bible*, i., page 309; Delattre, *Revue des Quest. Hist.*, July, 1876, page, 26, &c.; Delitzsch, &c.

was drawn up in the era of the kings. For already centuries before the era of the kings, Resen had flourished and sunk into decay—to such an extent that we have as yet been able to discover no record of its greatness among the ancient documents of the East. “This phrase of Genesis,” says M. Oppert,<sup>1</sup> “is anterior to the foundation of the first Chaldean empire, at the end of the twenty-first century before Jesus Christ, and far older than the splendours of the great Ninive.”

No difficulty can arise as to the meaning of Mesraim, the second son of Ham, which Josephus, and all interpreters since his time, take to refer in a very broad way to the inhabitants of Egypt. So, too, in the Assyrian inscriptions Egypt is termed Mizir, and the modern Arabs designate Egypt itself and its capital city by the name Mizir. Of the several sons assigned to Mesraim in the following verses (vv. 13, 14), Ludim, the eldest, as Maspero says,<sup>2</sup> personifies the Egyptians properly so called, the Rutu or Luta of the hieroglyphic inscriptions: whilst the Laabim are the Lybian people, who lived towards the west of the Nile. The remaining names, though opening up some of them questions of interest and importance, we are reluctantly obliged to pass over in silence owing to want of space.

“The name which follows that of Mizraim in Genesis,” says Professor Sayce,<sup>3</sup> “is still enveloped in mystery. Since the days of Josephus it has been the fashion to identify Phut with the Lybians; but this cannot be correct, since the Laabim or Lybians are included among the sons of Mizraim.” It is clear that Phut does not represent the Lybians properly so called; but it is not so clear that the name does not represent a race of men who dwelt in that part of Africa known as Lybia. No doubt if, after the primitive settlement of nations, each people had remained fixed in its own boundaries, the Professor’s argument would have great weight; but, since it is an acknowledged fact that there were constant movement and migration amongst tribes in early

<sup>1</sup> *Expedition en Mesopotamie*, ii., page 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l’Orient*, page 11.

<sup>3</sup> *l. c.*, page 54.



times, it loses most of its force. Phut was, in fact, the first people that inhabited Lybia. In later times the Laabim entered and took up their abode in the same country; and so came about the change in its name.<sup>1</sup> But still, as Josephus informs us, the original population left behind many traces of their presence; for there was a river in Mauritania called Phut by the Greeks, and the adjacent country was named Phuta; whilst in Coptic the Lybians are known as Phuti, and in Egyptian as Nephaïat.

But then Professor Sayce brings some new light to bear on the question from the annals of the reign of Nabuchadnezzar; wherein it is stated that the Babylonian monarch, in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, marched against and defeated Amasis, King of Egypt, "as well as the soldiers of Phut-Yavan or Phut of the Ionians." It will be remembered that Yavan, that is, Javan, is the generic term used in the table for the Greek race; and so here we have evidently, as Professor Sayce claims, some Greek colony in Egypt, perhaps Cyrene. But, surely, the Professor does not wish to imply that the author of the ethnological table understands some mere Greek city by the term Phut in this passage! Does it not seem out of all proportion to put a city such as Cyrene on a footing of equality with races such as Cush, Mezraim, and Chanaan, among the sons of Ham; or again, Gomer, Madai, and Javan among the sons of Japheth? To us it seems out of the question. Nay, more, the discovery of a town named Phut-Yavan in Northern Africa seems rather a confirmation of the opinion of Josephus. For a very obvious interpretation of the term Phut-Yavan is, "that part of Phut belonging to the Ionians," or the "Greek colony in Phut."

In considering the last of the sons of Ham, Chanaan, we shall do well to remember what Professor Sayce says<sup>1</sup> on the subject of language. "Language," he says, "is a characteristic of man as a whole, and not of any particular section of the human family. It separates him from the lower

<sup>1</sup> *Civiltà*, l. c., page 429.

<sup>2</sup> *Races of the Old Testament*, page 29.

animals; it does not serve to separate one race of mankind from another. In other words, language is not a test of race!" Golden words, conveying a truth that will be obvious on a moment's reflection, yet but too liable to be forgotten! If, then, we find the Chanaanites, and indeed the Phœnicians, speaking a language akin to Hebrew, we must not forthwith declare them to be descendants of Shem, and the sacred writer mistaken in his ethnology. The Celts of Cornwall, the primitive Iberians of Ireland, and the negroes of the United States, all speak English; under the Roman Empire the various races of the West spoke Latin; the Jews of the dispersion conform to the language of the country in which they dwell: instances might, in fact, be multiplied indefinitely. But it is unnecessary. For it is generally admitted that we cannot argue from identity of language to identity of race. Language and race do not always coincide.

Chanaan in its broader signification includes Phœnicia; and, indeed, the Phœnicians called their eponymous hero *Xvâ*, and themselves *Xraoî*, or, according to St. Augustine, Chanani.<sup>1</sup> Originally it extended only from Sidon in the north to Gaza and Gerar in the south, and in an easterly direction to the Dead Sea. But afterwards these boundaries were enlarged, so as to embrace the Hittites, the Amorrites, and the Hamathites. "The language of Chanaan," as it is called by Isaiah (cix. 18), differed but slightly from Hebrew," says Professor Sayce; "how comes it that the Chanaanites, sons of Ham, should have spoken a Shemitic tongue? Herodotus and i. 1; vii. 89) others inform us that the Chanaanites immigrated to their later abodes from the Erythrean Sea, the early home of the Hamitic race. It was, no doubt, in the course of their long wanderings that they encountered people of Shemitic race, and so acquired the Shemitic language. The ethnologist, in the tenth chapter, sets down eleven sons of Chanaan, beginning with Sidon, his first born. We cannot pass over the Hethite, or Hittite, without a word of comment.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Delitzsch, page 317.

<sup>2</sup> *I. c.*, page 57.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, Dionysius.

Professor Sayce devotes an entire chapter<sup>1</sup> to the Hittite, in which he lays down that there is no social relation between the Hittite and the Chanaanite. But then it must be remembered that the Professor classes the inhabitants of Chanaan with the descendants of Shem. On the other hand, Lenormant<sup>2</sup> connects the Hittites with the Chanaanites; but regards the Hittites of the ethnological table as being quite distinct, except in name, from the mighty empire, whose primitive abodes were in the Taurus Mountains. That the Hittites of the tenth chapter of Genesis are an offshoot of Chanaan, we make no doubt; but it seems to us, moreover, that from these same Hittites the great empire of the same name derives its origin. It must, however, be borne in mind, that, when the ethnological table was drawn up, the Hittites were still but a comparatively insignificant tribe. Afterwards they grew, by accretion with other races: for we know that in the days of its power the Hittite empire was clearly a composite nation; in fact, at one period, it was governed by no less than twelve independent kings.<sup>3</sup> There is no reason, therefore, to be astonished if we find the language and physical type of the Hittites, in later days, different from those of their Chanaanite ancestors. The later Hittites are, in fact, related to the Chanaanite tribe of the same name, only as Celtic France of to-day is to the Teutonic Franks of old, or modern England to the ancient Angles.

The family of Shem is given last in the ethnological table, not because he was the youngest son of Noah, but because the sacred writer, intending in the following chapter to continue to treat of the Shemitic race, wishes to dispose first of the families of Japheth and Ham, so as to be able then to give his undivided attention to the family of Shem. The sons of Shem were, we are told (v. 22), "Elam, and Assur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram." Of Elam, the Ham, Hami, or Ilampi of the Assyrian inscriptions, Professor Sayce says,

<sup>1</sup> *I. c.*, pp. 130-142.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, ii., pt. 2, page 270.

<sup>3</sup> Vigouroux, *La Bible*, vol. i., page 314; Sayce.

that its population was non-Shemitic."<sup>1</sup> We venture to take a different view of the question, whilst admitting that in later days the Elamites developed many non-Shemitic peculiarities, both of language and physiognomy. These, however, are satisfactorily accounted for by the acknowledged fact, that the Elamite territory was first peopled by Hamitic and Turanian tribes;<sup>2</sup> and, consequently, that the Elamites became, more or less, a mixed race. Josephus, usually so reliable, is completely wrong in regard to Elam, whom he calls the ancestors of the Persians, an Aryan nation. It is now generally admitted that the Elamites inhabited Susiana, between Persia and the Tigris.

No doubt exists as to the Shemitic character of Assur, the forefather of the Assyrians. The features of the Assyrian, as portrayed on his monuments, and his moral and mental characteristics, are undoubtedly Shemitic. The word Assur seems to have been used in three distinct meanings. Sometimes it refers to the town Assur, the ruins of which are still to be seen at Kalah Sherghat,<sup>3</sup> near the junction of the Tigris with the lower Zeb; at other times it is used to denote the Assyrian territory, called also Mat-Assur, as distinguished from Mat-Kaldi, the land of the Chaldeans; finally, it is also the name of the principal divinity worshipped by the Assyrians: a god who was everything to them; their kings, generals, and ministers, being looked on merely as servants and officials. Is not the existence of a god Assur among the Assyrians a kind of guarantee of the accuracy of the Bible narrative? Does it not look as if this god Assur was none other than the founder of their race, whom they, like so many other of the nations of antiquity, raised to the rank of a god or a hero?

Arphaxad, the third son of Shem, was, through Heber, the father of the chosen people. Heber had two sons, Phaleg and Jectan—Jectan, from whom sprang all the Arab tribes (vv. 26-29), who departing from Chaldea, populated the neighbouring peninsula of Arabia; and Phaleg, from whom was descended Abraham and the Israelites. Are we to

<sup>1</sup> Page 59.

<sup>2</sup> Lenormant, *Manuel*, page 337.

<sup>3</sup> Sayce.

<sup>4</sup> *Cicilia*, l. c.



identify Arphaxad with the Chaldeans, as Josephus had done? Some, as Bockhart,<sup>1</sup> are disposed to connect the name with the people of Northern Assyria (*Ἀρραπαχίτης*); but the tendency of these days is to revert to the older interpretation, and understand by Arphanad the Kaldā or Chaldeans. One thing seems clear, that the Kaldā belonged to the Shemitic race,<sup>2</sup> and that Arphaxad is rightly classed among the sons of Shem.

Professor Sayce finds that the geographical principle on which he interprets the tenth chapter of Genesis is inconsistent with the presence of Lud in the table. "It cannot be correct," he says.<sup>3</sup> Of course, because he cannot find any people with whom to identify it in the zone which he has arbitrarily set apart for the sons of Shem. His difficulty is increased, because he has already found a place for the Lydians among the descendants of Japheth, by his remarkable explanation of the word Magog, as meaning Mat-Gugu, or country of Lydia. But, in reality, the Professor's canon of interpretation is clearly at fault, for there is no reason in this case for departing from the common opinion of ethnologists, which identifies Lud with the Lydians in Asia Minor. "The most recent investigations," writes Lenormant,<sup>4</sup> "of the little we know of the Lydian language and of their traditions, goes far to prove their Shemitic blood."

Of the Shemitic character of Aram, the Aramu, the Arimu, or Aramu of the Cuneiform inscriptions, no doubt can be entertained. The descendants of Aram dwelt in Syria and Mesopotamia, as far as Armenia, and, according to Strabo (xiii. 4, 6), settled also in Cilicia.

We have now passed in review the chief nations of the ethnological table; and if it should be asked whether, in the tenth chapter of Genesis, Moses undertakes to present to us a complete catalogue of the descendants of Noah, we have no hesitation in replying that he does not. He has confined himself almost exclusively to the white race, taking into account those people only, some knowledge of whom was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Delitzsch, page 337.

<sup>2</sup> Sayce, page 63.

<sup>3</sup> Page 40.

<sup>4</sup> *Manual*, page 60.

likely to prove useful to the people of Israel. Accordingly no mention is made of the nations of the extreme east of Asia, as the Mongolians and Chinese (the yellow race); whilst the red race of America and the races of Oceania are altogether excluded. Nor can we even go so far as to say that all those nations known to the Hebrews are included in the table: for we find no mention of the negroes; and yet they must have been well known to the Israelites, figuring, as they frequently do, on monuments and inscriptions, and since we know that the Pharaohs often fought against them, and carried them as captives into Egypt.<sup>1</sup>

And if we are at a loss to account for the widespread extension of the human race at a very remote period, it will be well to bear in mind the following facts,<sup>2</sup> with which we shall conclude this paper. First, there is no reason why we should not believe that Noah, in the three hundred and fifty years during which he survived after the flood, begot sons, who, as did Shem, Ham, and Japheth, became the fathers of many nations. So, too, we may suppose that other sons were born to Shem, Ham, and Japheth besides those mentioned by the inspired writer. In fact, this is plainly stated in the case of Shem, since we read that, during the five hundred years he survived after the birth of Arphaxad, "he begot sons and daughters." Moreover, we may state with the writer in the *Civiltà*, and Lenormant, that nothing in the Bible forbids our holding that some of the families descended from the three Noachian patriarchs left the common centre of the human race before the erection of the tower of Babel; and thus gave rise to those races which, developing in absolute isolation, have assumed a completely distinct physiognomy, and remained shut out from the history of the rest of mankind. The tenth chapter of Genesis professes only to include those nations which, after having lived together and spoken the same language in the land of Senaar, were dispersed in consequence of the disaster of Babel.

J. A. HOWLETT, O.S.B.

<sup>1</sup> *Civiltà*, page 436.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Civiltà*, *ut supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xi. 11.

## OUR CONFRATERNITIES:

HOW ARE THEY TO BE WORKED EFFICIENTLY?

**G**REAT is the work to be done by pious confraternities in our time. Immense are the spiritual benefits they are expected to confer on the faithful. This is evident to the most casual observer. The great desire manifested on all sides for their establishment; the care taken to have them get their annual retreats; the spiritual treasures laid open to them by the Church; all would go to show the high value set on them as a means of sanctification for the faithful.

The bishops have words of encouragement for the members of confraternities more frequently than for any other members of their flock; the most efficient workers among the clergy are charged with their spiritual care; they hold an honoured place in public processions. No parish is considered as worked efficiently without its confraternity; and certainly it must be acknowledged, that if the various pious associations hold out many advantages, the faithful of our time show as laudable a desire to join them, as was shown in the days of St. Bonaventure, when so many thousands flocked to be enrolled in Our Lady's Confraternity, under its banner Confallon; or when, as Father Bridgett tells us, in *Our Lady's Dowry*, as many as nine hundred and nine guilds existed in one county alone in England—that of Norfolk.

Holy Church, too, lays open to them her spiritual treasury. The members of confraternities can gain a plenary indulgence on the day they enter, on the day of their death, and at very short intervals of life between. Communication in the good works of several religious Orders is accorded them. So favoured are they, that their graces and privileges run very close to those of the religious Orders themselves. Throughout the year, and on the great feasts of the Church in particular, what spiritual banquets are set before them. In their case is verified to the full the scriptural promise:—  
“I will feed them in the most fruitful pastures, and their pastures shall be in the high mountains of Israel: there

they shall rest on the green grass, and be fed on fat pastures." (Ezec. xxxiv. 14.)

From the large favours then bestowed by the Church on confraternities, from the great care taken of them by pastors of souls, and from their ever-increasing number throughout the country, we must infer how great is the work they are expected to do in enabling large numbers of the faithful to advance along the ways of piety.

But if the work to be done by confraternities is great, great also is the duty of working them properly. Without this the intended good will never be realized. How many confraternities do but little good, and end in nothing. The graces offered by a confraternity, are like all other graces from God to man: they require earnest co-operation in order to bear fruit. The proper manner, then, of working confraternities is a problem demanding serious attention; and, as there is some diversity of opinion on this head, and a greater diversity still of practice, it can hardly fail to be of use if the matter be submitted for investigation, and collating of experiences in the *I. E. RECORD*.

The following is what has been occurring to the writer on the subject, during an experience of several years in giving retreats to confraternities; under which term are meant to be included all pious associations that are obliged by rule to hold meetings at fixed intervals.

#### A GLANCE AT SOME ADVANTAGES OF CONTRATERNITIES.

But, first of all, let us glance at a few of the benefits which membership in a confraternity brings with it. The maxim, that union gives strength, is clearly exemplified here. The union of many together, under certain rules for their safe guidance, and in the bonds of holy brotherhood, for their common good, gives additional strength to all for its attainment, by the mutual edification and encouragement which the members afford each other. This particularly holds in regard to the weaker ones. Just as in our day, secret societies may claim the pre-eminence of being the most formidable enemies of the Church, from that strength which they derive from being banded together for a common,



though an evil, purpose; so too for the counterpart in good does the Church look to the union of her children in pious associations.

St. Alphonsus would place one of the great advantages of confraternities in their furnishing the means of perseverance; particularly, the frequent use of the sacraments, which by outsiders, he says, are generally neglected. Experience fully bears out the truth of the saint's remark. Of the many promises made during missions, in regard to frequenting the sacraments, how few are kept, except by certain of the confraternity members. But amongst the special benefits which it offers, must not be omitted this one, namely:—the encouragement which it gives, and the facilities which it affords to the faithful, of leading good Christian lives, and of sanctifying themselves, even though living in the midst of a wicked world; and in this way the confraternity becomes a great and efficient agent for the sanctification of the parish.

For such of her children as aspire to the more perfect life, and feel called to retire from the world, the Church has the evangelical counsels, and the seclusion of the cloister: but as the many cannot aim at this, and have received no such call, to them the Church says, stay where you are, remain at the post of duty in the world; but remember you are to endeavour to sanctify yourself at it. "This is the will of God, your sanctification." (Thess. iv. 3.) There is the confraternity in your parish; it has its rules for your guidance; it offers you the necessary helps: but keep these rules, and avail yourself of these helps, and you are sure to sanctify yourself. You cannot fly from the world, it is true; God gives you no such high call; remain in it then. His Church will help you by means of the confraternity. She needs the good Christian worker in the midst of society; she needs him in every walk of life, at every trade and occupation—in the forge, at the loom, plying the needle, over the desk, handling the plough or the spade, hauling the net, directing the machine; be you that good Christian worker, wherever your sphere of duty may lie. One thing I ask you: be an observant member of the rules of the confraternity, and

behold you walk in the ways of piety, even though surrounded by a wicked world. These rules are not many or difficult : they are not above your strength ; they are few and simple, but practical, and well suited to your condition in life ; only keep them, and you are sure to advance along the way of salvation.

A confraternity that would succeed in corresponding with these designs of the Church, besides its blessings to its own members, would become a great and efficient agent for the sanctification of the parish. It would do this in a variety of ways : by the good example of its members ; by the contradiction they would give to the false maxims and demoralizing conversation going on around them ; and by the sound Catholic public opinion prevailing amongst them, particularly in regard to matters affecting the interests of the Church. What good confraternity man, for example, would stand silently by and hear his clergy reviled, and the teaching of the pastors of his Church slighted ? Lastly, it would do this by its furnishing a refuge and a rallying-point to such among the people of the parish as should be desirous not only to receive an absolution from sin, but who would, furthermore, aspire to form themselves to regular habits of a good Christian life—of the kind, we presume, that is led in the confraternity.

Take the case that so often occurs of the sincerely converted sinner. He feels the miseries of the abyss into which he had fallen ; grace has been at work within his heart, and he repeats again with the prodigal, “*surgam et ibo ad patrem meum*” (Luke xv. 18) : and he resolves to lead a life more worthy of his Christian calling. He looks around for the means to carry out his purpose. There is the confraternity close at hand, in his very parish. The lives of many of its members have edified him, and traced out a model for his own conduct. It is a confraternity, we suppose, that is efficiently worked : not one in name merely, but one that in reality corresponds to its end. He knows that by joining it he puts himself under the happy necessity of living well, of moving *pari passu* with its other members. He counts the costs, and is determined to pay. He knows there are

moments before him when dark temptation will again renew its assault, when he will feel impelled to kick against the goad, and when he will have to submit to let himself be dragged on by his comrades under the yoke, or else fall back into his former abyss of misery ; and when nothing else but his thus being dragged on at such a moment can save him. Having thus counted the cost he joins, and the result is, that by the help of the confraternity he lives a good Christian life ; whereas left to himself he had not gone on many steps when he again became an easy prey to his old weakness, or tottered and fell under the first rude shock of temptation. Thus it is that the different classes of sinners in a parish who find within them a call and a grace, not only to rise from sin, but to aim at a thorough change of life, have in the confraternity abundant helps to attain their object ; thus it is that the number of the bad is being continually diminished, and that of the good continually increased ; thus it is that quiet conquests for God are being made every day by the confraternity ; and hence it must be regarded as a powerful agent for sanctifying the parish.

How often has it not happened that the tide of victory has been turned back and a battle won by one division of the all but beaten army having maintained its ground and discipline, thus giving the fugitives time to rally and reform their ranks ? how often has it not happened that one religious house, which took up or retained its ancient discipline, has been the means of spreading a reform through a whole relaxed order ? So, too, in a parish where there are, let us suppose, two or three hundred confraternity men or women who hold aloft the standard of moral uprightness in their lives, can they be other than a powerful means of spreading the blessed contagion of virtuous living through that whole parish ?

And what has been said in regard to the sanctification of the parish generally, holds, as a matter of course, in regard to the suppression of any great vice in particular ; as, for example, that of intemperance. The confraternity is a powerful agent for restraining it, even though it be not professedly a temperance association. But this will appear

clearer later on, when it will be seen that the giving scandal ought to be visited with a certain penalty which the rules of a confraternity are so well calculated to inflict.

But if these advantages are to be conferred by a confraternity, they are, be it well understood, by a confraternity well worked, and by it alone. The graces it gives are like all the other graces from the treasury of God to man, even those necessary for eternal salvation itself. They must be turned to profit by man's co-operation in order to bear fruit. The confraternity must be efficiently worked, or else it will do but little good. "Of what use is it," says St. Alphonsus, "to a man to have his name enrolled among the brethren, if he do not attend the confraternity, or if he attend it without frequenting the sacraments, the performance of which latter duty is the most important of all its rules?"<sup>1</sup>

#### THREE THINGS NECESSARY FOR THE PROPER WORKING OF A CONFRATERNITY.

We now come to certain points in connection with the proper working of a confraternity which form the chief drift of this paper, what precedes being intended as a preparation. These points are—that attendance at the confraternity meetings, and the avoidance of public scandal, be insisted on as necessary conditions for continuance of membership in it; and also that the confraternity retreats be confined to the members of the confraternity itself, and to such as wish to join it. These points require some elucidation.

#### ATTENDANCE AT THE MEETINGS TO BE INSISTED ON.

Attendance at the meetings, and under penalty of exclusion, except where just cause for absence is shown, is either implied or expressly inserted in the rules of confraternities. In those of the Holy Family, for example, not only is this laid down in express terms, but, furthermore, the giving up of the badge is also required. For this reason, the heads of guilds and prefects of sections should be punctual in their duty of marking the attendance, that thus the director may have certain data to go upon in forming his judgment on the conduct of members in this particular.

<sup>1</sup> Sermon to the Brethren of a Confraternity.



If attendance be not insisted on, a host of evil consequences will follow. The retreat, let us suppose, has been just given. The number of members is up to four hundred. There is full attendance at the meetings. This continues for a few months; then several begin to fall away, some from sloth, some from carelessness, others from graver causes. The benches before long are left half empty. This thinning of the attendance has the effect of making it thinner still. The falling away of their companions dispirits the observant members, and makes them waver also. The vacant seats on right and left exercise a certain influence on making the central seat vacant too. Now, if all this be allowed to go on without a corrective, it must ruin the confraternity. The only adequate corrective in such a case—supposing due warning is given, and charitable remonstrance tried—is to exclude the contumacious non-attender from the confraternity.

Again, there is a general communion or public procession, let us suppose. The confraternity members appear with their badges. If the members irregular in attendance as well as those who are regular are allowed to walk in the confraternity procession, and wear the confraternity badge, very little honour will accrue to the confraternity on that day, or to its badge: that badge that many were too slothful or too careless to wear for so long a time before; that badge that has been dragged through the mire by the vicious or scandalous lives of many others, and the result is, that the confraternity is not looked on as an institution of honour or character, as it should be; pitying and contemptuous eyes are cast on several of those who walk in that procession; the more so, of course, from their being decorated with their present ensigns of piety; and it requires some coercion to induce people to join it, instead of their being drawn by the sweet odour of its ointments. The following is a case in point, out of many that might be given: A certain good-living man was asked some time ago to join a confraternity. He refused, on the ground of the scandalous lives of some of its members, notwithstanding which they were allowed to remain in the confraternity. Whether he was right or wrong

in his so acting, is not the question here to decide; what is relevant is, that such was the fact, and such its circumstances.

Another reason for insisting on attendance at the meetings, and under pain of exclusion, is, that when people receive many and great graces, and are afforded special opportunities for leading good lives, they ought not to be allowed to rot in idleness, but be made to do at least something to correspond with these graces: "*cui multum datum est multum quaeretur ab eo*," says Holy Scripture (St. Luke xii. 48); and, again, we see from the Parable of the Talents, that the divine economy in the work of man's salvation requires his making a good use of the graces offered him. Now the confraternity members receive many and great graces; they are under the special care of a director; they have the benefit of hearing God's word in conferences that are specially suited to their wants; they have exceptional facilities for approaching the sacraments, and are encouraged to their frequent use by the prospect of gaining so many plenary indulgences; they have retreats often when the eternal truths are put before their minds as vividly as before those of any community of Trappists or Carthusians. Now, if, after all these graces, a confraternity man lets himself go to rot, and is allowed to do so with impunity: if he lets himself sink back into deadly, perhaps habitual, vice, culminating occasionally in public scandal: if this has been going on for years and years, has not the case of such a confraternity man become very serious? Does it not recall to our minds the words of Holy Scripture: "*In terra sanctorum inique gessit, et non videbit gloriam Domini*" (Is. xxvi. 9)? or, again, that other: "*Terra autem saepe venientem super se imbrem, et germinans herbam opportunam illis a quibus colitur accipit benedictionem a Deo. Proferens autem spinas ac tribulos reproba est, et maledicto proxima, cujus consummatio in combustionem.*" (Heb. vi. 8.) Is not the sin of such a man the greater from his having received such light and knowledge in the confraternity? "*Scienti legem et non facienti peccatum est grande.*" (St. Ambrose.) Does not his sin assume a darker dye, particularly in case of habit, if it be the sin of

one who has been, let us suppose, in the confraternity for a dozen years, with the lights of a dozen impressive retreats cast on his soul? If the spots of the leopard are not removed by such an outpouring of grace, and the skin of the Ethiopian not brightened, it follows that the spots become more clearly marked still, and the skin darker.

Of course, it is not to be inferred, that because a man sins, and that his sin has reached the degree of scandal, that therefore he is a habitual sinner, as his sin may have been the result of a passing weakness or extraordinary temptation. Conceded; but it is also to be said that the sin which appears is often the result of habitual indulgence in sin which appears not. How far sins that become manifest are attributable to one or other of these causes, belongs to a problem which it is not for poor mortals to presume to solve; nor is this necessary for our contention, which is, that sin attaining to the dimensions of scandal, should be visited with striking off from the confraternity.

But it may, perhaps, be said, if I exclude such a man, he will go from bad to worse. To this it may be replied, that the general good of the confraternity, and the keeping it in a healthy state by cutting off disedifying members, is to be preferred before the private good of the individual. Besides, you wrongly assume that you are doing him good; you do him no good by letting him hang on as a useless member. Better, even in the interest of his own good, to exclude him from the confraternity; and if he honestly wishes to belong to it in a way profitable to himself, let him start his probation again, win admittance by improvement of conduct, and afterwards maintain his position by conformity with the rules of the confraternity and with the standard of Christian living.

Frassinetti in his *Parish Priest's Manual* would not be so lenient as this. He says: "The parish priest must be cautious to admit into these congregations only such as are steady and pious; for if bad boys be admitted, they will do no good to themselves, but will bring ruin to others. Nor ought we listen to the specious pretext, that if wayward and badly disposed young persons of either sex are excluded

from the sodality they will be deprived of the means of improvement, and will daily become worse. For experience teaches, that when the bad associate with the good, so far from imitating their good example, they corrupt the good. The priest should adopt other means to reform the bad—advice and correction.”<sup>1</sup> Here we see our esteemed author is careful to guard the sound moral tone of the sodality, and looks on this as so necessary for its well-being, that he will have none admitted to it at all but those of a good, or an already amended life.

But, after all, can it not be urged that we are to be merciful in such cases? By all means be merciful, and let mercy and zeal be employed in visiting the confraternity delinquent a second and a third time even, either by the head of guild, prefect of section, or director himself; but if all will not do, don't turn your mercy into cruelty towards the confraternity by allowing disedifying or dead members to remain hanging on, and thus dragging it into disrepute, or tainting it with gangrene; do not leave your mercy to be misunderstood by such a delinquent, as if it might be left to appear in his eyes as a sort of condoning of his scandal or an indulging his self-conceit; whereas he should be made to feel that habitual negligence or public bad example are not such trifles as not to affect his position in a pious confraternity. The director who does not cut off unsound members from it, cuts off the right arm of his own efficiency in working it. He deprives himself of the immense corrective power which he can exercise over any of the three or four hundred members of his association who becomes a delinquent; and in exercising it over anyone, he is administering a wholesome stimulant for observance to the three or four hundred others; and thus his action must contribute powerfully to put down vice, and serve to promote the general moral tone of his parish. By one stroke of discipline opportunely administered, a director, perhaps, may do more good than by a dozen conferences: and in so doing, does he not seem to act in accordance with the spirit of the Church throughout the ages? *Pia mater* as she is, she yet knew, as



we see all along her history, how to carry out her disciplinary laws with a firm hand; and even goes so far as to hurl her excommunication at such of her children as should be guilty of a simple act of negligence—that of omitting Easter duty.

At the same time, when the non-observant member is cut off from the confraternity, this does not, of course, by any means imply his removal anything further from pastoral care; on the contrary, he has a stronger claim on this than ever, and needs more compassionate treatment; but for this treatment, as Frassinetti observes, there are other and abundant means which the zealous pastor can use.

But, again, it may be remarked, perhaps, that it would thin the confraternity if careless members were to be struck off. Quite an erroneous assumption, at least as far as regards the real, and not merely the apparent, good of the confraternity. You will not thin the confraternity by a process that would only make its life-blood purer, and remove from it that which would but give it a deadly taint. On the contrary, you do what will make it stronger and more vigorous; so that if there be a thinning or a bleeding, it is a bleeding for health and not for decay. People, you may be sure, will flock to a confraternity, and join it the more willingly, the purer they find its life-blood, the healthier its spiritual state, and the sweeter the odour of virtue it sheds around.

But, again, a difficulty may be urged: namely, is there not here a question of raising the standard of too high a virtue, and, therefore, one which must fall to the ground as impracticable, being quite beyond the reach of people who have a hundred worldly cares weighing upon them. This is again unfairly assumed. Attendance at the meetings (and not even this when cause of absence is shown), and the avoidance of public scandal, are the only two points insisted on. Surely, no one can say that this is raising aloft the standard of too high virtue or of perfection.

#### THE RETREAT TO BE CONFINED TO THE CONFRATERNITY.

The confraternity retreat ought to be confined to the members of the confraternity. Retreat, as the term in its

usual acceptance, and as the thing itself implies, means a course of spiritual exercises given to a particular class of persons, or section of the flock, who make profession of piety to some degree in advance of the general body of the faithful; and whose spiritual state, therefore, requires a nicer and more special treatment. In this respect, it differs from missions and triduumms which are for all. If you open any religious book with the word *retreat* on its title-page, look through its contents, and consider the classes of persons for whose use it is intended, you will find that this notion of retreat is borne out.

Now, a confraternity retreat, if it is true to its nature and purpose, ought to make frequent reference to matters that are of peculiarly confraternity interest; to the good example which confraternity members should give; to the duty of corresponding with the greater graces they receive; to the necessity of keeping the rules; to the greater scandal a confraternity man gives by his sin, and so on. From all which it is evident that the confraternity retreat ought to be confined to the confraternity itself; for if the general public be allowed, the preceding remarks cannot be made without turning it into a *spectaculum*, and a gossiping material for the whole parish.

The retreat, however, should be open to former members—to those who had been cut off, and who now wish to join again; but they ought not to be allowed to take places in the guilds, or sections, or wear the confraternity badge till after due probation and re-admission. It might also be open to such as wish to join for the first time, and to some others who, for special reasons, may like to make the retreat just then; but this, by way of privilege, and guardedly: admission, say, to be given by note from the parish priest or director; otherwise the whole thing becomes a general movement once more, and goes beyond the scope of the retreat.

Other reasons also exist for thus confining the retreat to the confraternity members, with the extensions just indicated. While the annual retreat is a grace suited to the tenor of life which should be led in the confraternity, and

therefore ought not to have the edge of its moral applications blunted by being thrown open to all, it is also the privilege of the confraternity. Now, it is necessary for the existence of a privilege that it be hedged round and guarded; that it be not made common property: if it be, you destroy it, and in so far injure the status of the body to which it belongs. If you knock down the walls of the privilege by having the retreat thrown open to all; if strangers are allowed to rush in; if the members are not allowed to appear in their guilds or sections, wearing the ribbon and medal; or if they are crushed out or huddled together; if they have to wait outside the confessional while others are being heard; if thus their privilege is gone, you lower the flag of the confraternity in the eyes of its own members, and in the eyes of the public. All will learn to think less of a confraternity whose rights and privileges they can enjoy as well outside it as inside. But here, you will say, is a poor lost sheep that has been going astray for years, and that now receives the call of mercy: will you exclude him from the retreat? By no means; let him get a note from the parish priest or director, as has been already said, and be then admitted. Or, again, it may be interjected, are the members then so uncharitable as to grudge the extension of their grace and privilege of retreat to others? They are not, if there is no injury done their grace or privilege by the extension; but if its special fitness for them as a grace is in great part destroyed by the admission of strangers and outsiders, then they are not uncharitable in not granting the extension. That this latter is the case, has been shown; and it is on this principle, though, of course, with other strong reasons for its application, that retreats to students and boarders are not thrown open to all.

#### EVIL CONSEQUENCES OF TURNING RETREATS INTO MISSIONS.

Again the system of turning retreats into missions, is no less damaging to the interests of missions; particularly in the case of abandoned souls and hardened sinners.

A mission is in its nature an extraordinary grace. It

demands great sacrifices from the people ; sacrifices of time, of convenience, of business interests ; sacrifices in the offerings they make, often from limited means ; in the deep and earnest consideration they are called on to give to the great and awful truths of religion ; and this for whole weeks continuously. These sacrifices which the people make, and the extraordinary graces they receive, stir up a spirit of enthusiasm which communicates itself to the hardened sinners ; and at last the leviathans of the great deep begin to move. Woe betide the day and the place when missions are given, and when the great sinners remain unmoved. There is sure to be in that place a lower stratum, where secret societies are germinated. St. Alphonsus, in his treatise on the exercises of the missions, lays down two principles for the guidance of those who give missions. They are, that when given they should be given thoroughly ; and, again, that they should not be repeated too often in the same place. If the mission be not made thorough, particularly in certain important parts of it, he agrees with Mgr. Falcia, whom he quotes, in saying, that it is "conducive to the ruin rather than to the saving of souls." The great point the saint seems to have at heart in laying down these principles was, to have the mission settle consciences that it stirs, and that it be made to reach those who are deepest in sin.

Now here is precisely the faultiness of the system of turning retreats into missions ; that while they but imperfectly do the work of the retreat, they but half do the work of the mission ; yet by a not uncommon kind of hallucination, are supposed to do for both. They are but attempts at missions ; and still, furthermore, they pave the way for the failure of the real mission. The retreat, or quasi-mission, is given yearly, or nearly so, let us suppose. The people after some years get accustomed to it, and many of them begin to let it go by. They let it slip this year, because they know they will have a chance of it again next year ; not a few span over the Easter duty in waiting for it, thinking little, of course, of turning a deaf ear to the pastoral voice at that time ; yet when the retreat comes they are little moved by it, because



of its frequency in the parish it has come down to the level of an ordinary grace. High pressure is put on to bring the people to the retreat-mission this year, next year, and every year, and it ends in not bringing them up any year. Having become somewhat too familiar by frequency of repetition with quasi-missions, they learn to make little of the real mission. Hence, when the latter is given, the deep impression fails to be made, that would stir up from their depths of vice the hardened sinners; and thus the chief glory of the real mission is swept away, by the parrot mission cry and frequent repetition of its poor imitators.

Hence in many dioceses throughout different countries where regulations are made—and they are made in many—whether for fixing the maximum or minimum of time within which missions are to be given, an interval of some years is always supposed or required to intervene between one mission and another, in the same place. St. Alphonsus says, that “missions should not be renewed too frequently in the same place; it is expedient that they be given at an interval of at least three or four years.”<sup>1</sup> To renew them too often, would not only be opposed to the opinion of a saint of such vast missionary experience; to the principle formulated in the synodal regulations of so many dioceses; but would also appear not to derive its inspiration from the spirit or custom of the Church, which in the granting of her extraordinary favours—jubilee, for example—takes care that they be not bestowed too often.

But perhaps it may be said, that, granted the preceding remarks have the weight of argument and authority on their side, still we must take into account the force of circumstances that may surround our case. There are other grounds, are there not, on which it is expedient and even necessary to admit the general public to the retreat, namely, the economic ones. The giving of a retreat means the incurring a certain amount of expenses; and without at all infringing on the Maynooth statutes regarding the application of surplus money from mission collections, may

<sup>1</sup> *Exercises of the Missions.*

it not be necessary to admit all, in order to meet the necessary expenses. This, though at first sight it would seem a difficulty, can hardly after all be regarded as such. The members of the confraternity ought to meet the expenses of the confraternity retreat, either by collections during it, or for some time previous. There are hardly any confraternities that would not be able and willing to defray their own retreat expenses; ay, and that would not look on it rather as an insult, to have to stretch the hand to outsiders for help in such a matter.

But, again, some may be inclined to think that in a place where retreats of any kind, or missions, are given but seldom, that there, at least, there is a fair footing for merging a confraternity retreat into a mission. The proper thing in such a case would be, to have a mission. Why thus tenaciously cling to a retreat, when after all a retreat it is not to be? Why not have a real mission, which though a short one, does away with the misnomer retreat; makes things fall into their proper order; and brings the missionary and the people into a position of rightly understanding each other? The mission need not be a long one, when the population is not large; and here it may be remarked in passing, that when the mission is short, a mistake is sometimes made in making the number of the missionary staff small instead of large, and then having to rely for confessional work on confessors that perchance may be able to lend aid towards the end of the mission. A third missionary Father, during a short mission, suppose of a fortnight, hears more confessions than twenty confessors who give help the last days of the mission, as a moment's consideration will show. He is, let us say, ten days out of the fourteen in the confessional; but his work there is assiduous. It goes on from early morning till late at night. He puts in what may be called ten full days. In the case of the twenty confessors, many of them have to come from a distance; others must give a part of the day to some pressing duty of their own, so that the average hardly come up to a half-day; thus the twenty half-days but equal the ten full days of the regular confessor. In general, it may be said that to have a small missionary

staff, one that is not proportioned to the population, is a great mistake. A small staff means hurried confessions; hurried confessions mean sometimes unsettled consciences; and unsettled consciences speedily relapse. The rule for confessors, on which St. Francis Xavier and St. Alphonsus lay so much stress, namely, on their thoroughly discharging their duty towards the penitents who are then and there before them, rather than on hastening through, in order to hear those who may be waiting outside the confessional, holds particularly in regard to mission confessions, when consciences are stirred up by hearing so many sermons. The confessor who in such occasions would go much beyond forty penitents in the day—a full day—although he may persuade himself he has done a good work, nevertheless, if the opinion of his co-labourers in the field were taken, they would lay claim to the finishing off part of it in many cases. Often the grounds of that finishing off is not unbosomed to another confessor, and then it becomes a drag on the new life the penitent proposes to lead. St. Alphonsus, speaking on the matter, says: “For myself in the missions that I had to conduct, when I had not a number of missionaries in proportion to that of the faithful of the place, I found it better not to give the mission, and to give it in another place for which the number of confessors was sufficient.”<sup>1</sup> But this, by the way: so to return to what more directly bears on the subject.

It may, perhaps, yet be urged in favour of not excluding outsiders from the confraternity retreat, that where this has not been done hitherto, to do it now in the touchy times in which we live, that people would not stand it; that it might tend to break the peaceful relations that have hitherto existed between pastor and flock.

In regard to their not standing it, we are not come to Presbyterianism yet. An explanation of the nature and object of a confraternity retreat ought to be enough to show people they have no right to it except by belonging to the confraternity; and if this will not do, they ought to be given

<sup>1</sup> *Exercises of the Missions.*

to understand that the parish priest is the judge of the law in this matter, and not they.

In regard to straining the peaceful relations hitherto existing between priests and people, is it a fact that we have before our eyes the spectacle of universal peace in our day. And, if not, it becomes our duty to strive, by every means, to bring back, in its completeness, so desirable a blessing. Now, we are persuaded that the enforcement of a little discipline, such as we have been describing, in the matter of retreats and missions, would contribute not a little to the attainment of this object, by making the spiritual exercises of the people more productive of the fruits of peace, and preventive of the abuse of grace.

#### WHAT DISCIPLINE WOULD SEEM TO REQUIRE.

The interests of discipline, in every sense of the word, would appear to be better consulted for by not confounding retreats with missions, but by keeping them quite distinct, and each thorough in its kind: "*via vite custodienti disciplinam*" (Prov. x. 17); and again the Scripture says: "*Qui obicit disciplinam despicit animam suam*" (Prov. xv. 32). The missionary father who is sent by his superior to conduct a retreat, is he always quite in order in extending it to the dimensions of a mission? and when applications are made by directors of confraternities for faculties for retreats, is it always to be understood, that faculties for the far wider work of missions are granted by their lordships the bishops?

And as to the people, have they not to be taught somewhat, and trained to habits of order and discipline? When a retreat is given to a confraternity, or a mission to a parish, ought they not to be reminded to regard them as such, and take them to be what they really are; to attend a mission when it is a mission that is given, and to leave to the members of the confraternity the retreat, when it is a retreat that is given? Many of them have got into the fashion of dragging the priest their way, instead of their going his way. Is not a little correction useful for them in this respect? and is it not well to let them understand that they are not to



trample down the fence and enter their neighbour's clover-field, as the notion may strike them ; but that if they will enjoy that luxury, they must go the right way about it ; that is, make application to the proper authority, and enter by the gateway ?

Again, are they not to be taught that if they are to continue in the enjoyment of the graces of the confraternity, and of its annual retreat, they are to merit it by continuance at the confraternity meetings, and by conforming their lives to such a standard of moral uprightness as at least excludes scandal ; that if they make promises at the time of renewal of baptismal vows, and enter into engagements in joining a confraternity, they may not break through all with impunity ; that if they arrive at such a pitch of enthusiasm as would storm heaven to-day, they are not to collapse to-morrow, as if there were no heaven to be won, without at least something in the shape of a reminder.

It is in the light of discipline that we can best see the speciousness of certain objections which are sometimes urged against the orderly working of confraternities. For example, when it is said a retreat is about to be given, had it not better be extended, and made to do good to the whole parish ? To this may it not be fairly answered, you are not doing the good you imagine by such a course ; or, if you do some good, it is good which is mixed up with a certain amount of evil results, as we have already seen. Your system produces evil results as regards the retreat, whose fitness as a confraternity retreat it destroys : evil results as regards the mission for whose failure it paves the way ; evil results as regards the people, whose undisciplined habits it corrects not, but rather encourages.

Far better would it not be to do good to your people, but yet so as to impress on their minds at the same time lessons of order and discipline. Are you not doing good, and extending the good to all the people of the parish, by having an excellent confraternity in their midst, with its rights and privileges guarded ; with its retreat made telling, and conducted in such a way as to give the spiritual food that is required, with its spirit of piety therefore flourishing : with

its rules observed; with the light of its good example shining around: a confraternity, in fine, wherein those who wish to join will find the real helps and real stimulus to a Christian life: and from which those who do not join, will find real edification? Are you not doing good to the parish in all this, and are you not doing it more in accordance with the ways of God, of whom it is written, that He orders all things justly: and again, that He orders them "in measure, in number, and in weight"? (Wis. xi. 21.)

Discipline, then, in every sense of the word, is one important factor in the working of confraternities. Perhaps it may be said that we are not yet sufficiently removed from the effects of the disorder caused by the dire persecution of the past, and the long operation of the penal laws, for our people to have acquired those steadier and more disciplined habits in virtuous living that form the heritage of other Catholic lands, whose traditions were not broken by any such disturbing causes. Doubtless, something to this effect might be urged. But be this as it may, it affords no valid reason for slackening the reins of discipline now when circumstances are altered, but rather a reason to the contrary. Lost ground had better be recovered than increased.

Finally, it may be well to give in brief, and under a few headings, what has been put at length in the preceding pages. They are:—

(a) That, while the confraternity is intended by the Church to confer immense blessings on its members, and, through them, on the parish generally, if these blessings are in reality to be gained to any considerable extent, it is absolutely necessary that the confraternity be efficiently worked. Worked efficiently, it becomes a powerful agent for promoting piety amongst its members, for putting down vice, even such a great one as that of intemperance, and for edifying and sanctifying the parish generally; that, in fine, confraternities well worked are the regenerators of society.

(b) That, besides the zeal of the reverend directors in holding the meetings regularly, in giving the conferences, in affording facilities for frequenting the sacraments, in seeing

that prefects and heads of guilds do their duty in marking the attendances—all which are supposed, the cardinal points on which the efficient working of the confraternity will depend—are, the confining the retreat to the confraternity members, and the cutting off from it all negligent or scandal-giving ones. It may here be added, as a matter of fact, that the most successfully perhaps, certainly the most extensively, worked confraternity in Ireland, cuts off from it about three hundred such inobservant members annually.

(c) That to fail in these respects, is, to make use of a vicious system in the working of the confraternity, which carries with it the proof of its own inaptitude in the fact of persons of careless or scandalous lives still being in a position to call themselves confraternity members, and to wear the confraternity badge, thus contributing little to the edification of the parish, thus repelling from the confraternity, instead of drawing to it. Frassinetti's remark is worth repeating, that there are several in the parish, and their proper place is outside the confraternity, not inside it; yet, of course, under vigilant pastoral care.

Now as there are confraternities in almost every parish throughout the country, and as there are clergy of zeal, learning, and experience, occupied either in directing them or conducting their retreats, it is not too much to say, that further, and most likely sounder, elucidation of the subject in hand, which some of the reverend brethren might find it convenient to give, would be on a matter of vast practical importance, and one that affects largely the present interests of the Church in Ireland.

Meanwhile a hope may be indulged in, that the full and complete solution of our problem will have an effect similar to that of other solutions in physical nature; namely, that of reducing things to their simple and original elements; and hence, when a retreat is given, be it a retreat, and not turned into another thing; when a mission is given, be it a mission, and not a pretence to, or an attempt at one: when a confraternity is in a parish, it ought to be a confraternity with at least its essential rules kept, and not one that allows itself to be a mere medley, made up of the

observant and non-observant ; when a confraternity is to be worked, let the working have something of a purifying and refining process in it, and not an amalgamating of dross and pure metal ; besides the profession, let it be the reality.

M. GEOGHEGAN, C.S.S.R.

---

## “ *HORÆ LITURGICÆ* :” OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL.

THE TEACHING OF THE MISSAL, FROM SEPTUAGESIMA TO  
EASTER SUNDAY.—II.

### THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

THE general thought of this Mass is preparation for Confession ; Holy Church exhorts her catechumens and penitents to prepare themselves for a sincere and full confession of their sins. On this day in the ancient discipline the examination of the catechumens was held, and the faithful were called upon to declare what they knew about those who were petitioning for baptism. The main idea of this Mass is, of course, applicable nowadays for the instruction of the faithful who are preparing themselves during this holy season for their Easter duties.

The Introit (Ps. xliii.) directs our thoughts at once to God, to whom confession is made, and before whose eyes everything is open and known. “ My eyes are always towards the Lord, for He shall pluck my feet from the snare . . . in Thee do I trust, let me not be ashamed.” We may note the reference to the snare of sin, which catches hold of the sinner, and which is broken by a good confession ; for then, as earlier Scripture says, “ the snare is broken, and we are free.” We have also a prayer against false shame in confessing what we had no shame in doing. The Collect seems to be a prayer against the dumb devil of the Gospel, that humble sinners may be defended by the right hand of God. The Epistle (Eph. v.) mentions certain sins, those of the flesh especially, which are unhappily so



often the cause of false shame, and which are the favourite opportunity of the dumb devil. The Apostle warns us not to let *anyone* seduce us by empty words to hide our sins, for from this comes the wrath of God upon the children of unbelief, who think that God searcheth not the reins and heart. But we must walk in love, as being the most dear children of God, and not fear to tell our merciful Father our offences. We need not fear that Christ will be unforgiving, for He hath loved us, and given Himself for us. We have the light of grace from on high to know our sins, and so it becomes us to confess them in goodness, justice, and truth. The Gradual (Ps. xxxix.) speaks of the struggle between the dumb devil and the sinner, and calls on God to arise and help us. The Tract (Ps. cxxii.) is a song of trust in the Lord, and of waiting on Him until He showeth mercy towards us.

The Gospel (St. Luke xi.) is the miracle of the casting out of the dumb devil. Our Lord warns us to be armed and on the watch, if we would possess our soul in peace against the enemy; to be armed with faith in His mercy in the Sacrament of Reconciliation, and to watch lest we give way to the promptings of false shame. He tells us also that half measures in His service are of no avail: so if we are not altogether on His side, and gather as He gathers, we are, as a matter of fact, in opposition to Him, and scatter and waste His treasure. The return of the seven more wicked spirits is a picture of the sad state of him who has polluted his soul by a sacrilegious confession. It is worse than the former. The Offertory (Ps. xviii.) tells us that God's justice and judgments are right, and make glad our hearts, for we get real liberty only through the truth. We are, not as we think ourselves to be, or as men think, but as God sees us. The Secret prays that by the merits of the Sacrifice we are about to offer, our sins may be taken away and we be made holy. The Communion (Ps. lxxxiii.) tells us where is our true home, from which we have strayed by sin: even where the sparrow hath built her a nest: “Thine altars, O Lord of hosts;” and they that return, by a good confession, to their Father's house, will praise Him for ever. The Post-communion pleads by the great mysteries we have received,

that God would mercifully turn towards us and receive us back, as the father received back the prodigal, forgiving us our sins, and rebuking us not for our ingratitude.

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Lent is now half over, and, motherlike, the Church gives us a little breathing time, as it were, before entering upon Passion-tide with all its sorrows. She fears lest we be over-sad with too much sadness, so she bids her ministers resume their festal dress, and instead of purple vesture she clothes them in the brighter hue of rose-colour. The organ, too, which has heretofore been silent, now pours "contrition from its mouth of gold," and adds its power to lift our hearts upwards to the heavenly Jerusalem. In the liturgy our Holy Mother sets before her catechumens and penitents, in language well guarded and figurative, the great mystery of the Eucharist, as the crowning gift she has in store. The catechumens had only a very dim idea of some certain great mystery, which was to be the source of all their joy and hope, and which would be in due time disclosed; but the penitents had already tasted of the heavenly mysteries, and were looking forward with longing hearts until they were once more admitted to the banquet of the children of God. So we can read between the lines of this Mass, and see that the golden thought running through it all is the thought of Holy Communion; and Holy Church rejoices and exults at the thought of the coming Paschal Communion, which will unite all her faithful to their Maker.

The Introit (Ps. lxxv.) is a strain of joy at the thought of all this, and points out that it is in the Church that all blessings are to be found. "Rejoice with Jerusalem . . . all ye that love her; be ye glad with joy all ye who were in sadness . . . and be ye filled with the breasts of your consolations." "I was glad at the things said unto me: we will go up to the house of the Lord." (Ps. cxxi.) These words tell their own story, especially the Psalm which so beautifully expresses the thoughts of those who were about to enter the house of the Lord, wherein to be inebriated with "the breasts, which are as clusters of grapes" (Cant. vii. 7),

and be filled with consolation. The Collect prays that we may be refreshed by the coming grace of divine consolation. St. Paul, in the Epistle (Gal. iv.), tells us that we have our right to partake of the banquet of the children, from the fact that we are the children of the free woman, the heavenly Jerusalem, which is our mother; and that when we are made free from the yoke of sin, we shall be enjoying the liberty of Christ. The Gradual (Ps. cxxi.) recalls the thoughts inspired by the Introit, and prays for the peace of the Church, and abundance of merit and peace within for those abiding in her strongholds; and the Tract (Ps. cxxiv.) carries on the thought, and bids us remember that those who put their trust in God, and make use of the Medicine of our soul, abide in the Holy City, and never will be moved.

The Gospel (St. John vi.) gives us an account of the wonderful miracle of the multiplication of the loaves; and in this we can see a fitting picture of the Blessed Sacrament, and of our Divine Master's loving concern for our spiritual nourishment. "Whence shall we buy food that they may eat?" His love solves the problem, and He Himself secures our food. He treats us in His Church as honoured guests, and makes us sit down in "the place of pasture," in which He hath set us, "for there is much grass" prepared for our comfort. At His tables the guests are indeed filled, and their eyes are opened, and they would fain make Him their king: but Jesus flees away into the solitude, *Ipse solus*; as though to tell us that we must follow Him, and make Him king over our hearts: not for His gifts' sake, and because we are filled, but for His sake only. *Ipse solus.* God alone. For what is Holy Communion but as He describes it, "I in you, and you in Me"? With these thoughts in our heart a light is thrown upon the Offertory. We praise God, for He is kind and sweet and mighty. How kind is He to those who love Him, how sweet is He to those who taste and see, how mighty is He to those who see the wonders He works in the Blessed Sacrament, those alone can say who follow Him into the solitude, and make Him their king. The Secret prays that our devotion and health of soul may be increased by the sacrifice we are about to offer. The Communion (Ps. cxxi.)

refers again to the Church, which is the source of all blessings to us, and is our true Mother. She is at unity, and we, her citizens, are also at unity, "for all eat of that one bread," as St. Paul says; and being made one in Christ, our unity is the witness to the world of the divine mission of the Son of God, and of the Father's love for the world. (Cf. St. John xvii.) The Post-communion prays that we may use God's graces aright, and that the heavenly gifts with which we are so often filled, may be received in all duty and faithfulness.

#### PASSION SUNDAY.

"To-day if ye hear the voice of the Lord, harden not your hearts" is the first cry of Holy Church to her children at the opening of Passion-tide, for now she is beginning the solemn commemoration of the death of her Divine Spouse. With a consummate knowledge of human nature she knows that after the careful preparation her catechumens and penitents have been through, there is no thought which can so well carry on to an end the good work they have begun than that of the death of "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world." So she seems to have now on this and the following Sunday no thought save that of "Christ, and Him crucified," and she brings forward all the details of His Passion, so that her children may well know what it cost "the Lord of Glory" to redeem them. In the Liturgy we hear the very voice of the Sacred Victim Himself speaking to the Eternal Father, and disclosing to us the sentiments of His sacred heart. Sorrow and mourning now fill the holy places. The holy images and pictures are veiled in purple, and even the very Image of the Crucified is hidden so that we may realize Him more in our hearts. His image is not needed now to remind the Church of the Victim, for how can she think of aught else when the day of His death is at hand? Then, again, we are reminded hereby that our sins have made us unworthy to look upon Him whom we have pierced; and it is not until the great oblation is offered that we can dare to lift up our eyes, and plead for pardon by His merits. During this time the Church omits even her



ordinary song of praise to the most Holy Trinity, as if to suggest to us that the sacrifice of Jesus is the highest act of praise and adoration which can be paid to the ever-blessed Three in One.

The Introit (Ps. xlii.) is the voice of Jesus appealing from the judgment of the Jews to that of His Father: "Judge Thou Me, O God, and know My cause full well from the ungodly nation. From the wicked and crafty man, oh save Me . . . Thy light and Thy truth have led Me out, and have brought Me to Thy holy mount;" yes, even in the eternal light and truth to the holy mount of Calvary. The Collect is a prayer that we may have true courage in body and soul to continue the work of our salvation. In the Epistle (Heb. ix.) the Apostle sets before us the thought of our great High Priest accomplishing by His sacrifice all the typical offerings of the Old Law. What a ground for confidence that He who has begun the good work in them will carry it on cannot the catechumens and penitents find in the words "how much more will the blood of Christ cleanse our conscience from dead works . . . for He is the Mediator of the New Testament . . . His death interceding, that they who have been called . . . may receive the promise!" In the Gradual (Ps. cxlii.) and Tract (Ps. cxxviii.) we again hear the voice of the august Victim praying to be freed from His enemies, and calling on the Father as His deliverer; for from His youth upwards have they beset Him, and have prepared the scourge and other sorrows. Truly in the beginning of the book of His life it was written of Him that He should do His Father's will; and the first word He uttered in entering this mortal life was "Lo I come."

The Gospel (St. John viii.) tells us of the hatred of the Jews towards Him who "hath done all things well." They call Him a Samaritan, and one given over to the Devil. The latter blasphemy our dearest Lord denies, but not the former: for as St. Gregory says in the Homily read this day at Matins, Samaritan means a watchman or guard, and Jesus is indeed the Watchman set up on high to guard His Church; and as the Psalmist says: "Unless the Lord watches

over the city, in vain do they watch who keep guard over it." And now on the eve of His Passion, when the people were raging furiously together against the Lord and His Christ, and He was about, of His own free will, to lay down His life for our salvation, the good Master proclaims once more His eternal origin: "Before Abraham was I am:" as though to give one last warning to those who were preparing to take, and with wicked hands crucify and slay Him, a man approved of God (cf. Acts ii.). "Then Jesus hid Himself, and went out of the Temple." May He hide Himself in our hearts!

The thought of the Passion fills us with confidence in Him who is about to redeem us, and so in the Offertory (Ps. cx., cviii.) we praise Him, and promise to be faithful to His law in which we are quickened. The Secret prays that sin's bonds may be loosened, and God appeased by the gifts His mercy allows us to offer. The Communion (1 Cor. xi.) recites the words of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and reminds us thereby that the Mass is the very same sacrifice as that of Calvary—"the showing forth of the death of our Lord." As is usual, the Post-Communion is a prayer for perseverance for those who have been re-created by the heavenly Mysteries.

#### PALM SUNDAY.

The Liturgy for this day presents two ideas to us: one, of the triumphant entry of our Lord into Jerusalem, and the other of the Passion which was so soon to follow the short-lived triumph. Holy Church commemorates the former in the first part of the Office, and the Mass is entirely occupied with the Passion. As we are only here treating of the Masses, we will pass by the blessing of the *Palms* which is omitted in private Masses.

The Introit (Ps. xxi.) is from that wonderful Psalm in which David prophesies of the Crucifixion. Christ is nailed to the cross, and the Sacred Victim reveals to us from the altar of sacrifice the anguish which beset His Soul in that dark hour: "O Lord, let not Thy help be far from Me. Look Thou to My defence. Save Me from the lion's jaw,

and My lowliness from the horns of the unicorns." "O God, My God! look then upon Me. Why hast Thou forsaken Me? far from My salvation are the words of My sins." Our Lord seeks not to escape the sorrows of the expiation, but prays to His Father for a speedy ending of the awful iniquity which was being wrought; and, as St. Paul says (Heb. v.) "He was heard for his reverence." He prays not to be wholly deserted in death, and yet He knew and had accepted beforehand, even that mystical withdrawal of divine consolation which it pleased His Father to exact, and which wrung from Him "with a great cry and many tears" (Heb. v.) the first words of this Psalm. The "lion's jaw" and "the horns of the unicorns" may be taken as our Lord's will that, after the sacrifice was consummated, His Sacred Body should not be given over to mutilation by the Roman soldiery, or to the disposal of the Jews, whose form of offence was a blind and perverse hatred of the Holy One. "The words of My sins" remind us that the All-Holy One was made to bear the burden of our sins, and was charged with the debts of all our race. The Collect prays that as we have the proofs of the patience of Him who was led like a lamb to the slaughter, so may we be led on to follow Him in the way of the Cross, and be made sharers in His Resurrection.

St. Paul reminds us in the Epistle, that He who suffered was true God and true man, and was obedient in all things to His Father's will: hence is the name of Jesus given to Him, for "He shall save His people from their sins." (St. Matt. i.) The Gradual (Ps. lxxii.) is a reflection on the Epistle just read. The Divine Victim is led by the will of His Father, and sustained by His right hand, and for His obedience is glorified. He says: "How good is God to Israel, to the upright of heart!" and He tells us why, because He was zealous for sinners, and sought their salvation: because "He loved us, and gave Himself for us." The Tract is the greater part of Psalm xxi., which Casiodorus calls a history rather than a prophecy, so clear is its application to our Divine Master's sufferings. From the very first words which He used on the Cross, from the gibes of the Jews on Calvary where hung He who was the outcast of the

people, “a worm and no man,” from the casting of lots upon His vesture to the proclamation of the fruit of His victory for the generations to come, this Psalm is like the exact description of an eye-witness, and every verse is pregnant with meaning. We may just note the reference to God’s justice, as made manifest in the Passion of Jesus, and the birth of the Church, the *populus qui nascetur, quem fecit Dominus*.

The Gospel shows us the fulfilment of what David saw so clearly in vision, and no words can attempt to draw out the pathos and meaning of this simple story of God’s love and man’s sin. Deeply as this history fixes itself in our heart as we read it, yet Holy Church would make it go deeper down, and bring it more home to us by the Offertory (Ps. lxxviii.), which opens to us the source of the exceeding sorrow and heaviness which abode in the Sacred Heart during the three hours’ agony: “My heart did expect reproach and misery, and I waited for one who would sorrow together with Me, and there was no one. I sought for one to comfort Me, and I found him not; and they did give Me gall for food, and in My thirst they gave Me vinegar to drink.” Abandoned in mystic dereliction by His Father, the only One who could comfort Him, and deserted by His Apostles, and with none left to do Him reverence, our Divine Lord makes loving complaint of our ingratitude: “In what have I wearied thee,” that there should be none to comfort Me and stand by Me in this hour of sorrow? As He offered Himself a living sacrifice, so would He have us “go out with Him, and die with Him.” The Secret prays that, through the renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary, our cold hearts may be touched with devotion, and be made worthy of attaining eternal happiness. In the Communion Holy Church impresses on us the truth that the victim of our salvation was fulfilling the will of His Father, and that “He was offered because He willed it.” The Post-Communion prays that by the working of the mystery of Calvary just now renewed on the altar, we may be made clean from our vices, and filled with just desires.



## EASTER SUNDAY.

"Alleluia to the Risen Lord, the Victor and King" is the cry of Mother Church on "this day which the Lord hath made," the greatest solemnity of the year. Sorrow and sighing have all fled away, and Holy Church is filled with supreme joy at the triumph of her Divine spouse, and the fruits of His passion in her white-robed children, fresh from the baptismal waters, and her penitents reconciled and risen with their Lord to a new life. Here she prays that "death may no more have dominion over them," who are the trophies of the victory of Jesus over sin and death! The whole liturgy of the day is wonderfully expressive of heavenly joy and grace, from the first exclamation with which she ushers in the feast at Matin, "The Lord hath truly risen, alleluia;" and she lavishes her alleluia, that *dulce carmen*, throughout the day as though she could not repeat it often enough. To-day heaven's gates seem to be thrown open, and we can catch the echoes of the triumphal songs of our Fatherland which the "ransomed of the Lord" sing to the glory of the Lamb who hath redeemed them in His own blood.

The Introit (Ps. cxxxviii.) is our Lord's voice when rising from the grave and praising His Father: "I have arisen, and am still with Thee, alleluia;" and in the psalm we have a remembrance to "the lying down" in death upon the altar of the cross, and the "uprising" in power and majesty to immortality.

The Collect celebrates our Lord's victory over death, and shows us in this victory the gage of our own immortality. In the Epistle (1 Cor. v.) St. Paul, who has been our faithful teacher all during the time of penance and sorrow, lends us his warning words, and impresses on us the consequence of the Resurrection; namely, that we must lead a new life: and a special word of warning is given to the new Christians as to the character of their rejoicing and feasting on this great day. It is not to be, as was their wont, in the leaven of malice and wickedness, but in the chastened spirit of sincerity and truth.

The Gradual (Ps. cxvii.) is another outburst of joy on this day of days, for the mercies of God which are for ever,

and which are witnessed to by Christ, made our Passover. The Sequence is full of deep beauty, and rich in subjects for meditation. How tender is the passage, "The Lamb hath redeemed the sheep: Christ the Innocent to the Father hath reconciled sinners." The last verse is a profession of our faith in that mystery without which our faith would be vain, and then, as though we can say no more, we crave the mercy of the Victor King who hath purchased us by His blood as a "people of acquisition."

The Gospel is the simple recital of St. Mark (xvi.). How the stone which has weighed so heavily upon us these last weeks is now rolled away, that heavy load of sin. Heaven bids us now no longer fear: for Jesus, the Nazarean, the One "set apart" as the worshipper of the Father, who was crucified, is arisen, and He is, as the sequence calls Him, "our hope;" and we shall see Him in His kingdom; "as He hath said to us." In the Offertory (Ps. lxxv.) Holy Church makes use of the words of Israel's royal singer singing of the Lord's arising for judgment over sin and death whom He hath laid low by His victory. Well may the earth tremble with awe, and then be still with lowly hope, in the presence of this wonderful exhibition of God's power, and well may the powers of the world be abashed and hushed in the presence of their Conqueror.

The Secret refers to the Paschal mysteries now wrought and commemorated in the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and when the sacrifice is consummated we have again St. Paul's words given in the Epistle to remind us that the Mass is indeed our Passover, and the sprinkling of the blood of the Lamb, which saves us from the destroyer and from the "house of bondage;" therefore should we feast on this banquet of angels in the untainted spirit of sanctity and truth. The Post-Communion is a fitting conclusion to this wonderful Mass, and is a prayer full of happiness, praying God to fill us with the spirit of His love, that we may always be in accord with His loving-kindness.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

“ DE CONFESSIONE PARVULORUM.”

**H**EARING the confessions of children is one of those things that presents great difficulties to some priests. They speak of how hard it is to get through this work of the ministry; how unsatisfactory, because of the confused manner in which children tell their faults, because of the uncertainty of their sorrow, and purpose of amendment; whether the faults confessed are sufficient matter for the sacrament, and so on. Apparent difficulties, such as these, make for many priests the confessions of children an irksome and uninviting duty, and hence sometimes is permitted that reprehensible error with regard to the confessions of children before their first communion; viz., not hearing them sufficiently often, nor sufficiently well. It happens occasionally also that children are sent away without absolution, who ought to receive it; and this, either because the confessor wants to be too secure in the administration of the sacrament, or because, perhaps, he does not wish to go to the trouble of disposing the children to receive it.

Frassinetti in his *Parish Priest's Manual* describes the manner in which some persons hear the confessions of children. They listen, he says, to whatever sins the child tells them (there would be no time to question them on what they may possibly be omitting, and then they say: “Now, be a good child; be obedient to your parents; hear Mass devoutly; and say your prayers regularly. For your penance, say three Hail Marys. Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis, &c. The confession is finished! Another child comes into the confessional, and in this manner they are heard by the hundred in a short time.

“Now [he asks] can this be called hearing the confessions of the poor children, or is it not rather mocking them, and going through a burlesque of the sacrament. Children of seven years old are capable of sinning, and do sin; and this is still more true of children who have attained the age of eight, nine, ten, and eleven years, an age at which some of them have not yet received the Holy Communion. And when they have sinned, and sometimes grievously, are they, on presenting themselves for

confession, to be mocked in the manner described above? Surely a simple benediction, instead of sacramental absolution, is no better than a mockery!

“ Wherefore, when we sit down to hear the confessions of children, we ought to have the intention of administering the Sacrament of Penance, of which absolution is an essential part. If they lack discretion, or if they have not sufficient matter for the sacrament, we may give them a simple benediction, and dismiss them in peace. But, if they have the full use of reason, if they accuse themselves of grievous or notable sins, we ought to exhort them to sorrow for them, we ought to endeavour to dispose them for sacramental absolution, and then we ought to absolve them just as we would adults.”

So far Frassinetti.

“ *Caveat sibi quisque* [says St. Charles Borromeo] *ne praeceptum minoris aetatis, scilicet a recto patiat, quasi pueri sint qui nondum ad usum rationis pervenerint, quorum audit confessiones; solet enim usu venire ut in pueris etiam, quamvis in aetate sint adhuc tenera, peccata mortalia inveniantur.*”

“ *Sabido in pueris, in quibus minime credas, inveniuntur peccata etiam mortalia; et in aliis tardius, in aliis vero citius, adest usus rationis sufficiens ad peccandum. Ideo prudenter cum illis agendum, ut deprehendatur veritas, et non doceantur peccare.*”<sup>1</sup>

“ *Pastor, qui passim pueros non absolvit nisi ad tempus peccatae communionis, in omni — 1. Violatae justitiae, negans sacramentum et poenitentia debitor; 2. Violati praecepti confessionis tamen; 3. Periculo salutis puerorum; 4. Omnium peccatorum quae pueri ex defectu gratiae sanctificantis committere solent.*”<sup>2</sup>

As soon, therefore, as children come to the full use of reason, they are capable of mortal sin, and they are to look for pardon just in the same way as grown up persons, viz., through absolution: and consequently, not to hear the confessions of these children, nor absolve them, unless in case of death, would be to make a great mistake. And, even in case of death, when there is question of children, they are, perhaps, less disposed, or at least could be, than at another time.

It may be said here, by way of objection, that children do not easily or quickly commit mortal sin. But sometimes,

<sup>1</sup> Sylvius, in explic., past., S. Car. Borromeo.

<sup>2</sup> Concurs. Mech., 1753.



as we know, malice makes up for want of age. And, even if they had only venial sins to tell, why not absolve them, and give them an increase of grace? It may be said again, that this is not the practice of some good confessors; well, all that can be said in reply is, that on this point they can scarcely be called good; but rather, perhaps, fear the trouble, and want to be too secure.

Hearing the confessions of children, after all, is not so difficult, when we take a reasonable view of the matter, and undertake the necessary trouble. We may be told that children confess their sins in too *confused* and *unsatisfactory* a manner. Well, we shall bear in mind that, regarding the integrity of confession, penitents are only bound to tell their sins *in a manner proportionate to their capacity*; and that when anyone makes his confession as well as his capacity allows, he has made a good confession. Consequently, a child is bound to confess only as a child, and nothing more; and if it confesses confusedly, because it does not know how to do better, it confesses well, and is capable of absolution.

Another difficulty is about the *Contrition*. We are told that children can scarcely have sorrow for the faults they confess. We reply to that by saying that wherein a person sins, he can also by the grace of God repent. And St. Charles Borromeo says that that Contrition is sufficient of which *childhood is capable*; and Steyaert: “*Animus puerilis non exigit contritionem virilem.*”

The *Purpose of Amendment* is another difficulty with many. Since children, they say, have only small faults to confess, they will immediately commit them again. But that is not the question. Gerson replies: “*Tam puerorum, quam majoris aetatis, excipiendae sunt confessiones, etsi relapsuri videantur.*” And again: “*Hauritur aqua ex sentina etsi reditura; lavatur manus, etsi adhuc maculanda; aliter periret navis, sordes manui nimis cohaerescerent.*” In addition to this, we may say, that the grace received will help them to keep out of mortal sin; and, should they fall into it, will help them to arise more quickly.

In order, however, that the confessions of children may be made with the greater profit, it would be well to have

some system or method of doing so; and not, for instance, have a crowd of children coming into the church, in no order, and there, in noise and confusion, rendering it almost impossible to hear their confessions quietly, and carefully, and with fruit.

It may be asked what is the method to be followed out. Well, I suppose each one will have his own, which in all likelihood he looks upon as the best. But there is one given by Father Kerckehove—a holy man of forty years' experience and prayer—to which I take the liberty of referring. He would, where there are a great many children, as in towns, divide them into two or three classes—for this country, roughly speaking, say—the first class to consist of those who have not yet made their first Communion; the second, of those who have.

Having brought the children thus together to the church, and keeping separate the boys and girls, a short, simple, paternal instruction, he says, ought be given them, in which they would be so animated to confession, that they would desire to make it, rather than fear it. The necessary truths ought to be explained to them; after this, a short examination of conscience; the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity; finally, the Act of Contrition, that they may be truly sorry for their sins, and have the resolution to sin no more. In making these acts with the children, we shall find very useful two leaflets published by the Catholic Truth Society, and containing brief and beautiful prayers for children before Confession and Communion. *Segur's Treatises for Children* will also be found useful on these occasions.

As to the manner of going to Confession: it would be well, he says, to give one side of the Confessional to the boys, the other to the girls; and, that quiet and order be maintained in the church throughout, there ought to be some one—a teacher or his assistant—to watch over the children. When there is a large number going, it is recommended also, that there be, at least, two confessors, that in this matter the children may have full liberty.

The confessor will receive each child kindly and sweetly, that so they may not be afraid to declare all their faults. It

is recommended not to interrupt the child while it confesses, unless the confessor sees that it cannot, or will not. In this case he will prudently interrogate about the faults which children living in that place usually commit. After confession he will sweetly admonish them of their faults, and especially of those things which, perhaps, might be mortal sins. However, the confessor will take care not to judge anything a mortal sin, unless he is altogether certain of it. Then he will give Penance and Absolution, and, as far as he can, a light penance that may be easily said. “ *Penitentia autem his pueris injungenda levis sit, quantum fieri potest; et curandum est ut illa ab ipsis quantocius impleatur; alioquin aut eam obliviscentur, aut omittent.* ”<sup>1</sup>

St. Liguori also says that children, even doubtfully disposed, can be sometimes absolved conditionally, even though they have only venial sins to tell; and the reason is, lest they may be left too long without the sacramental grace, and, perhaps also, sanctifying grace, in case they should have some hidden mortal sin upon their souls.

By these helps then will children be led to make their confessions often and freely; their bad habits, if any, will be laid aside; they will grow up in virtue, giving glory to God and honour to the Church; and none but God can tell how much good, and how great fruits, may spring up hereafter from the way in which they were taught, and helped, to make their confessions when young.

J. LENNON, M.SS.

<sup>1</sup> S. Lig. praxi conf., n. 91.

## Theological Questions.

---

### "PULLING" HORSES, AND BETTING.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I have just read with pleasure, and I hope with no small amount of profit too, the very able and interesting paper that appeared in the last issue of the I. E. RECORD, on the subject of "pulling" horses at races, and betting.' The discussions of the various hypotheses made—all of them highly practical—cannot fail to be of advantage to one like myself, who has neither time nor ability to study such questions in our Theological Treatises. There is just one solution which some of your readers have a difficulty in accepting, and with your kind permission, I would suggest a still further exposition, for their and my own enlightenment. I shall state the difficulty as it presents itself, in my own words.

"In the absence of any fraudulent contract, a rider or owner, it would appear, is perfectly within his right, as far as any obligation in conscience is concerned, in 'pulling' or 'drugging' his horse with the object of securing lighter weights at a future race. That same horse competes in a future race, and this time, by reason of his lighter weights, and superior qualifications—well known to his rider or owner, but effectively concealed from the public at large—he turns out an easy winner. In this case it is contended the rider or owner would not be justified in accepting bets, and for the reason, that on a former occasion, he has deceived the public at large; and in deceiving them, made his success in the present instance a certainty.

"It would appear on the other hand there is no injustice, and a rider or owner is, practically speaking, in the case made, always justified in accepting bets. To say nothing of the practices of 'horsey' gentlemen—so well known to the public, and so cautiously checked and reined by official handicappers—it is a notorious fact, that favourites—adjudged to be such by the highest authorities—are frequently relegated to an inferior place, and there is therefore, until a race is actually won, always an uncertainty as to the result: sufficient, at all events, to justify an owner or rider in making a *bona fide* and valid bet.

"In a somewhat analogous case, there would appear to be no injustice. An owner of a horse instead of securing lighter



weights, and deceiving the public, by 'pulling' or 'drugging' his horse, attains both objects by keeping his horse to his own stables, and making private experiments of his qualifications. The horse comes forth for the first time to compete in a public race; and the owner, to whom his qualifications are well known, 'puts on his money;' while the public, from whom his merits have been concealed, are induced to bet against him. The horse turns out an easy winner; the bets are handed over to the owner, and although his position seems no better than the owner who pulls or drugs his horse, it would be hard to say that he is guilty of injustice.

"Again, the horse whose weights have been reduced, and whose qualifications have been concealed, by pulling or drugging, is permitted by the official handicapper to compete in the future race, and should he succeed in carrying away the prize, of which there is fair certainty, the owner is not adjudged guilty of injustice in accepting it. Now if he may accept the prize without any breach of justice, as against his competitors whom he has deceived, why may he not accept the bets as against the public at large, whom he has deceived in the same way?"

"I fear I have trespassed too far on your valuable space; but the importance of the subject, and the hope of further enlightenment are my excuse.

" SACERDOS MIDENSIS."

[We are extremely grateful to our correspondent for directing attention to a part of our notes on betting which certainly requires further elucidation. We regret we cannot spare time to deal with the question in the current number. But we hope to be able to answer his questions, and some others also, particularly the questions of "Sacerdos Salfordiensis," in the next number of this periodical.

D. COGHLAN.]

## Liturgical Questions.

### I.

#### THE FIRST PRAYER IN THE "MISSA QUOTIDIANA."

"REV. DEAR SIR.—The undersigned wishes a reply to the following:—A priest is asked to celebrate Mass for a deceased lay person, not on any of the privileged days, but on a semi-double on which he may say the *Missa quotidiana*. Is the first prayer for *uno* or *una defuncto*? Is the second prayer *Deus coram*? And the third *Fidelium*? The reason for putting the question is, that as I presume the Mass to be celebrated is the 'Missa Quotidiana'; and the first prayer of that Mass is 'pro defunctis Episcopis et sacerdotibus.' One not sufficiently instructed is in doubt about the first prayer, and indeed about the two others.

"I am sure that this question has been answered before, but all memories are not perfect, and the writer would most respectfully ask a precise, short, and decisive reply, which is never forgotten.

"LAONENSIS."

Our correspondent's question has, as he correctly surmises, been answered in the L. E. RECORD (Third Series, vol. xiii. n. 1, April, 1891). From the reply there given we quote the following conclusions:—

"The conclusion, then, at which we have arrived is:—1, that a priest satisfies an obligation of celebrating a private Requiem Mass for one or many by saying as the prayers the three given in the *Missa quotidiana*, and in the order in which they are given; 2, that, though not an obligation, it is nevertheless advisable that the first prayer should always be that which best suits the intention for which mass is offered."

Our correspondent should, however, bear in mind that if he says, as the first prayer, that one from the Missal which suits his intention in offering Mass, he should invariably say, as the second prayer, the *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, given in the first place in the *Missa quotidiana*, omit the second *Deus coram*, and in the last place say the prayer *Fidelium*.

## II.

## NUMBER OF CANDLES AT LOW MASS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—You will very much oblige if you kindly state in the next number of the I. E. RECORD whether you are aware of any recent permission for the use of more than two candles at a priest's low Mass, celebrated in a public church on feasts of no special solemnity, and occurring on week days when but few, or on Sundays when many, persons are present at the Mass. Does the parochial Mass enjoy any special exemption from the rule?

“VICARIUS.”

We are not aware of any recent legislation regarding the number of candles to be lighted at a low Mass. At a *strictly private* Mass, two, and only two, candles should be lighted—unless, of course, one or more additional are required on account of darkness. But a parochial Mass on a Sunday or festival is by no means to be regarded as a *strictly private* Mass; and, consequently, at such Mass more than two candles can be lighted. The words of De Herdt are clear and to the point:—

“Pro missis stricte privatis plures quam duo cerei in altari accendi nequeunt: sed quoad missas lectas conventuales et parochiales vel *similes* diebus solemnioribus, et quoad missas quae celebrantur loco solemnis atque cantatae occasione celebritatis et solemnitatis plures quam duo accendi possunt.”<sup>1</sup>

The word *similes* in this extract refers to Masses celebrated in chapels and oratories of religious communities, as is clear from the question addressed to the Congregation of Rites, to which De Herdt refers. It was asked:—

“Utrum diebus solemnioribus pro missa lecta parochiali aut *Communitatis*, prout supra accendi possunt plusquam duo cerei?”<sup>2</sup>

We conclude, therefore, that on Sundays and on the more solemn feasts, whether of the general Church, of a particular district, or even of a single Community, more than two candles may be used at Mass, whether the day on which the feast is celebrated be a Sunday or week-day, and whether there be a large or small attendance of the faithful.

D. O'LOAN.

<sup>1</sup> *Praxis Liturgiae*, vol. i., n. 184. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Sept. 12th. 1857. n. 5251. 9.

## Correspondence.

---

SOME CRITICISMS ON DR. BUTLER, ARCHBISHOP OF CASHIEL.

REV. DEAR SIR,—From the grave nature of some of the subjects discussed in the letter which appeared in your last number, I must ask you for more than the usual amount of space generally allowed to correspondents. The writer of that letter makes so many animadversions upon me, that, to prevent confusion, and consult brevity as far as is consistent with a satisfactory solution of difficulties, I will take them up, one by one, in the order in which they are laid out.

1. Though the dispute between Robert Butler, of Ballyragget, and Dr. Burke originated in 1761, when the bishop appointed a priest to Ballyragget, over which parish the Butlers claimed a right of patronage, the incipient quarrel did not come to a crisis till the middle of 1764. In 1761 Dr. Burke offered a temporary arrangement, to last till the case would be decided by Canon Law. The following year Robert Butler told a priest he intended to dispute the matter with the bishop, but he soon afterwards left the kingdom; and in the meantime Dr. Burke made a very necessary division of the union of parishes. It was only in the middle of the year 1764 that Robert Butler returned, and it was only in the month of August of that year that he made his appeal to Dr. Fitzsimons, alleging that he felt himself very much injured by Dr. Burke's appointments to the parish, and also complaining that the bishop 'muddled and curtailed the parish in a most strange, unaccountable manner.' His feelings must have been further aggravated the following April, when Dr. Burke held an ecclesiastical court near Ballyragget, in which, at the request of the principal inhabitants and the advice of all the priests present, he made a second division of the united parishes. It was not till the following month of August (1765) that the Bishops of Ferns and Kildare, who had been commissioned by Dr. Fitzsimons to try the case, decided in favour of the bishop, finding 'no advowson or right of presentation in the appellant.'

Now, James Butler, brother of the appellant, got dismissorial letters from Dr. Burke for tonsure and minor orders, 'pro hac diocesi Ossorienso,' in January, 1764, during the time his brother was out of Ireland. In May, 1765, nine months after his brother had sent in his appeal, and just three weeks and two days (April 30th



to May 23rd) after Dr. Burke's meeting near Ballyragget, he got his dimissorial letters for subdeaconship signed by the Archbishop of Dublin. I leave it to the candour of the reader to judge if I have made too much of the point in my article.<sup>1</sup>

"2. I was so much struck with Alban Butler's eulogium upon James Butler, especially as he affirmed he had no personal interest in his appointment, that I examined his letter rather critically. Out of respect for Alban Butler I *did* try at first to understand by the words quoted that James Butler had been in holy orders for four years: but, finding he had received subdeaconship only two years and nine months previous to the date of the letter, I was forced to conclude that it was a thoroughly misleading statement, or, as your reverend correspondent puts it, a deliberate falsehood.

"3. I am sorry I did not mention that Father Molloy was selected by Dr. Burke to be dean of the diocese: which fact, however, reflects far more honour on Dr. Burke, who returned good for evil, than upon Father Molloy, who had kept him in hot water for six years, after the bishop had received his second or *valid* collation to the mensal parish.

"4. I was quoting Finn's *Leinster Journal* from memory when I mentioned that a military force had been sent into Ballyragget. On looking over the files of the newspaper again, however, I find that the order was countermanded on December 21st, 1774, as there was no *accommodation* for the troop in the town, and in consequence it was sent on to Cashel. Nevertheless, military or no military in Ballyragget, the town was endangered by the very presence of the league: and it must also be borne in mind that the organized attack made upon it by the Whiteboys was an act of vengeance for the onslaught made upon them the very month after the league had been formed, on which occasion the gentlemen who were members of it issued from the town on hearing the Whiteboy horns, and pursued the poor wretches for miles along the road, searching every house by the way; and again, that while Dr. Butler on the one hand was complimented by Government for his loyalty, on the other hand such a terrible feeling of dissatisfaction spread through the diocese, that he was forced to write a public address, attributing the effusion of blood on the occasion of the attack on the town entirely to the 'wanton profligates' themselves.

<sup>1</sup> In what relates to the Butler family, I must here acknowledge the valuable assistance I have received from the Very Rev. N. Murphy, P.P., Ballycallan.

"5. I did not contend that James III. possessed no real right of nomination, but that a nomination by him was not open to the charge of undue influence. I quoted a letter from the Sacred Congregation to show that nominations of this kind were managed in such a way that the appointments to Irish sees were made solely on the merits of the candidates.

"6. The idea of Dr. Burke's 'prominent parade of his loyalty' to the Stuarts, is a myth, and the insinuation that, actuated by gratitude for benefits received,<sup>1</sup> he was guilty of the 'folly of putting the interests of an unworthy family above those of an entire nation,' is a mere stretch of the imaginative faculty. Towards the end of 1759, the very year of Dr. Burke's appointment to Ossory, an expedition was fitted out in France, mainly by the followers of James, for a descent on the Irish coast, and on Feb. 21st or 22nd, the following year, the town and castle of Carricklogus fell into the hands of Thurot. On the 29th of the same month, Dr. Burke wrote a circular letter to be read at all the Masses in Kilkenny the following Sunday; in which, after exhorting his people to behave as 'peaceable subjects, not giving the least shadow of offence to the government magistracy,' he thus concludes: 'We earnestly desire you to join us in offering most fervent prayers to the all-Merciful God, beseeching his divine Majesty to preserve this kingdom from intestine war or any other national calamity.'<sup>2</sup>

"7. It was quite a surprise to find my little pleasantry about the difficulty of finding things you are looking for in the *Illecebra Dominicæ*, pitted so mercilessly against me—a slender and fragile shaft, indeed, on which to poise a weighty argument. I will not stop to explain it—except for some rare individuals a witicism needs no other glossary than good humour. It was only after an exhaustive study of the book, during which, at the cost of much patience and labour, I culled most of the facts of Dr. Burke's life, that I was convinced there were no expressions in it reasonably calculated to offend the government of the day. How is it that two years after its publication 'personages in power' should have requested Dr. Burke to deal severely with the Whiteboys; and how is it that his circular letter on the subject should have been printed in seven of the Dublin papers and journals (Nov., 1761) and copied into the London *Chronicle*?

<sup>1</sup> See art. on Dr. Butler, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> From *Diocesan Register*, page 122, in handwriting of Dr. Burke.

<sup>3</sup> *Diocesan Register*, page 131.

"8. I again deny most emphatically the existence in the Supplement of any comment by Dr. Burke on the Nuncio's letter, for even the words *litteras aureas cedroque dignas*, a usual phrase of Dr. Burke's, can scarcely be said even to endorse it. He introduces the letter as follows:—'C xxi., page 725, Post lin. ult subjunge—A.D. 1768. Excellentissimus et Reverendissimus Dominus Nuntius Apostolicus Bruxellensis D. Thomas-Maria Ghilini Archiepiscopus Rhodiensis, Nobilitate, Doctrina et Pietate conspicuus, Litteras dedit vere aureas cedroque dignas, ad Quatuor Hiberniae Metropolitanos. Earum porro tenor ad Archipraesulem Dubliniensem est hujusmodi.'<sup>1</sup>

"In the three formulas of the oath lying at the bottom of the page, Dr. Burke is most careful in showing that the Nuncio is responsible not only for them, but also for the comment made upon them. '*Alia mihi (inquit Nuntius) exhibita est formula juramenti*,' etc. What was uppermost in Dr. Butler's mind in connection with the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, breaks out in his letter on this subject to Dr. Plunkett of Meath, in which he says: 'The Nuncio's letter which we all reprobated is brought to public light from Dr. Burke's Supplement to the *Hibernia Dominicana*, and the oath of our consecration is added to give it more plausibility.'

"9. The passages in the *Justification* to which I referred are those in which Dr. Butler institutes a comparison between Dr. Troy and Dr. Burke, describing the former as raised to the archiepiscopal see of Dublin after he had distinguished himself as a most loyal subject by using all the means in his power to check the insurrection of the Whiteboys; and the latter as receiving no higher preferment than he already enjoyed after the Supplement was published—an argument, by the way of no value, as no archiepiscopal see fell vacant in Ireland from that date till Dr. Burke's death. By omitting all reference to Dr. Burke's exertions against the Whiteboys, neither mentioning those previous to 1767, nor his efforts during the second great outbreak of 1775, three years after the publication of the Supplement, he, without doubt, implies that he was remiss in his duty. It is strange that Dr. Butler argues in this way at all, for in the circular letter of September, 1775, a letter which was printed in all the Dublin papers, Dr. Burke states that he was 'not only encouraged, but likewise requested to do this by personages in power.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hib. Dom.*, page 925.

<sup>2</sup> Original doc. in handwriting of Dr. Burke.

"10. The letter of Cardinal Castelli produced by your reverend correspondent as a proof that Dr. Butler was exact in his main contention in the *Justification*, and also as an unequivocal assertion and sanction of the position taken up by him from the beginning, fails in this precisely, that no theologian, even of the most extreme type, could take exception to any of the propositions contained in it, stated as they are. Even Bellarmine, so ardent a defender of the rights and prerogatives of the Holy See, and who carried on a long controversy with King James on the oath of allegiance, utterly rejects, in his *Considerations on the Censures of Paul the Fifth against the Republic of Venice*, the right of the Pope to interfere in concerns merely temporal, and asserts for him a right to the use of temporal power, both in temporal and spiritual concerns only when the good of religion requires the exercise of it. Accordingly, many theologians, while making no account of a simple denial of the Pope's temporal power in this kingdom, very properly hesitated on the additional words, "direct or indirect," which were inserted in the test-oath.

"Cardinal Castelli's letter, therefore, while containing no theological doctrine that might not have been written by Dr. Burke, was never intended and utterly fails to sanction the position taken by Dr. Butler from the beginning—viz., the determined stand made both at Cork and at the Charles meeting, and the disregard and implicit condemnation of the Nuncio's letter. It is one thing, too, that an oath contains nothing contrary to the principles of the Catholic religion, and quite another thing to take it; and it was blindness to this distinction that brought about the mistakes committed by the Gallican Church, whose indefensible position was the swearing to theorems and propositions, not positively erroneous, but still more or less at variance with the traditional practice of the Church. Add to all this, the disrespectful and irreverent terms used in the oath, which seemed to have weighed very much on the mind of the Nuncio when he described it as '*pluribus catholicis citimptabile et indignum præsulibus Catholicis.*'"<sup>1</sup>

"11. If Dr. Burke, in his letter to Rome, urged the essential identity between the oath of James I. and the oath of 1771, it must not be thereupon concluded that either he, the ecclesiastical historian, or the Nuncio, looked upon those who had taken either the former or the latter oath as suspected *de paritate pœcti.*" In



the language of the Nuncio, taking the oath was a '*talis et tanta inordinatio.*' And again, a '*perniciosa et scandalosa inordinatio.*' Without impugning the authority of Cardinal Castelli's statement to Dr. Burke, that the oath of James was suspected *de puritate fidei*, it may be safely said that historical facts do not warrant the inference drawn from it by your reverend correspondent, viz., that the same suspicion fell upon those who had taken that oath. Without doubt the words of Paul V. that the oath '*multa contineat quæ fidei et salutis aperte adversantur,*' create at first sight an enormous difficulty, which, however, is considerably lessened by observing that the Pontiff refrains from defining as heretical any single proposition of the oath. And the difficulty is lessened still more by examining the second Brief, which appeared the following year, much discussion in the interval having taken place in England; in which Brief, while strongly insisting on obedience to his former decree, he shows a marked disinclination to refer to the theological bearings of the oath. And afterwards, though at different times the Pontiff was asked by several, both of the English clergy and laity, to specify what exactly was contrary to faith in the oath, it was always without effect. After a discussion which was carried on for three or four years, and a further lapse of nearly seventy years, during which time several of the clergy and numbers of the laity had subscribed to the oath, a letter was written (1681) by the Chapter of the English Catholic clergy to Cardinal Howard, in which it was stated that 'more of the nobility, gentry, and commonalty, had actually taken it, or seemed resolved to take it,' and desired his Eminence to oppose an attempt, then supposed to be making in Rome, to procure a censure on those who took it. These facts considerably weaken the authority of Cardinal Castelli's statement to Dr. Burke, and fairly prove that though they who took this oath acted in direct disobedience to the commands of the Holy See, they were by no means suspected *de puritate fidei*.

"Now, it cannot be denied that the theological difficulties are just as great in one oath as in the other. Father Parsons, who entered the lists against King James, in 1608, contends that it is inconsistent with the integrity and sincerity of true Catholic doctrine and faith to deny that the Pope has the *indirect* temporal power, the denial of which was as clearly expressed, and as strongly insisted upon, in the oath of 1774.

"Though, after a time, the test-oath became very general, it was never universal in the Irish Church, in spite of an effort

in that direction made by Dr. Butler, in 1752, when he offered his alternative proposal, on the veto question, to the Government, that those candidates only should be chosen by the bishops to fill vacant sees who had taken, or were prepared to take, the oath. Therefore, while not admitting that the entire Irish hierarchy subscribed to the oath—for Dr. Sweetman of Ferns could never be induced to take it, and for a long time at least there was a want of unanimity in the Western Province in relation to it—I hold that from the whole history of the oath of King James, it follows that, even if all the Irish bishops and clergy had adopted and subscribed to the test-oath, it by no means implies that they would have been suspected *de puritate fidei*, or that the Irish Church had fallen away from the true faith.

"12. And yet it is no exaggeration to say that the position of the Irish Church was false and untenable. Dr. Troy, having been sent over from Rome by the Sacred Congregation, and at the desire of the Pope, expressly to carry out Dr. Burke's principles, turned completely round to the oath in a couple of years; though, in 1778, he defends his first position against the 'ignorant or designing persons' who had 'confidently asserted that the Roman disapprobation of the test-oath encouraged disobedience to government.'<sup>1</sup>

"However, some time after the death of Dr. Burke, the truth is, that the Court of Rome was compelled, under stress of circumstances, to deal with the oath as a *fait accompli*, and gave a silent and unwilling toleration of it as an abuse which happier times would remedy, keeping up at the same time friendly relations with the Irish Church on all other matters. That the Holy See does now and then, through motives of prudence, tolerate very serious matters it disapproves of, is clearly expressed in Pius VII.'s decision of the examination of Papal rescripts by foreign Governments. 'Where it is practised,' says the Pontiff, 'it is an abuse which the Holy See, to prevent greater evils, is forced to bear and tolerate, but can never approve of.'<sup>2</sup>

"13. This spirited letter of Cardinal Litta's also furnishes the clue to the path by which the Irish Church vacated her untenable position, bracing herself up to wrest from her enemies the stronghold of unconditional Emancipation. The Cardinal says in the letter that the Pope had been pleased to declare to him the conditions which *alone* his children could accede to *with a safe conscience*. His Holiness flattered himself that the Government

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Dr. Fallon of Elphin.

<sup>2</sup> See Cardinal Litta's Letter to Vicar Apostolic of London District, 1815.

of Great Britain would by no means exact from the Catholics any other oath, but such as, whilst it gave the Government itself a pledge of the fidelity of the Catholics, might at the same time neither clash in the least with the principles of the Catholic religion, nor cast any affront upon the same most holy religion of Christ. Then follow three simple formulas of oaths of allegiance, any one of which the Pope would permit the Catholics to take, and in none of which are to be found any of the obnoxious clauses that disfigured the famous test-oath of 1774.

“14. If loyalty to the Church of our country or to our religious associates is to blind us to patent facts, and set us reading history with one eye shut, and if truth is to be sacrificed to honour, we may as well put all our ecclesiastical historians back on the shelf. Nothing but a conscientious regard for truth has guided me in what I have written either about Dr. Butler or Dr. Burke. We cannot consult the honour of the Irish Church by affirming that she escaped scot free from the dangerous tendencies of Gallicanism and Febronianism which stealthily drew nearly all the Continental Churches into a long and humiliating captivity. While admitting the evil that barely touched her for a short period, we will seek her honour rather in the bold and determined way she shook it off, and stood once more before the Christian world *sans peur et sans reproche*.

“In conclusion, Rev. Mr. Editor, I beg to convey, as fully as possible, that my articles and this letter, here and there treating of Dr. Butler in his relations to Dr. Burke, in which the more amiable part of his nature did not come out, and in which he made the greatest mistakes of his life, would, of course, if taken by themselves, furnish a most erroneous estimate of his character. There is imperfection in all human things, and the best and holiest will make mistakes. In the voluminous correspondence of Dr. Butler, I have never stumbled against a single disrespectful word on the claims of the Holy See; yet such expressions were not uncommon in Ireland among ecclesiastics in his time, both in speech and writing. His loyalty to the Holy See, which is transparent in spite of his policy; his zeal for the beauty of God's house and the instruction of his people; his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament; his courage; and, lastly, the indefatigable activity in promoting his country's welfare, which brought him to an early grave, deserve to be remembered with gratitude and recorded to posterity. But such was not my task.--Yours faithfully.

“AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P.”

## THE "BULL" OF ADRIAN IV.

"As one of the *I. E. RECORD*<sup>1</sup> unbelievers in the 'Bull' to which Rev. N. Murphy alludes in your February number, I hope I may be allowed to make a few remarks. 'To give up the "Bull" [he observes?] would render it impossible to determine what historical documents may be genuine.' Is not this rather too strong? And he confesses<sup>2</sup> that, 'owing to the plundering of Rome on various occasions, and the dispersion of its literary treasures, the original copy of this Bull of Adrian has been lost.' Surely, incredulity about documents which have been lost need not extend to documents which have been preserved?

"Before marshalling his authorities, he begins<sup>3</sup> by 'Passing over the Confirmatory Bull of Alexander III., the authority of which can scarcely be called in question after the exhaustive article of the learned Dr. Malone.' Now, the Brief, or Briefs, of Alexander III. are quite as great puzzles as that of Adrian IV. Giraldus Cambrensis, a contemporary who certainly was not over timid about documents, gives the letter of Alexander, and then adds: 'As by some it is asserted or pretended that this privilege was obtained; so, by others it is denied that it was ever asked for.' And yet Giraldus, the indefatigable court historian of Henry II., was twice in Rome after the supposed appearance of this Brief. It is in vain, therefore, for subsequent historians to assume a more positive tone. What would historians say of a property seized and held by Henry II. with so suspicious a title, although it might come to pass that, as time went on, dread of the disastrous consequences of disputation would induce wise men—ecclesiastics or seculars, to let the matter drop, and allow time to do its work, by turning fiction into prescription. As to the 'reflection and instruction,' 'secular and ecclesiastical,' to which the rev. writer alludes, the exciting perspectives, past and present, which they open out are more likely to obscure than to enlighten. Unless we can discuss the business on its own merits, and with judicial calmness, we had better hand it over to those foreign judges who, especially in Germany, are devoting their energies to the elucidation of this most interesting historical controversy.

"W. B. MORRIS."

<sup>1</sup> *I. E. RECORD* (Third Series), August, 1885, vol. vi., pages 503-517.  
 Republished, *Ireland and St. Patrick*, page 65.

<sup>2</sup> Page 162.

<sup>3</sup> Page 170.

<sup>4</sup> Page 162.

<sup>5</sup> Opera viii., page 197, Rolls' Collect.



## Notices of Books.

---

ILLUSTRATED BIBLE HISTORY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. For the use of Catholic Schools. By Dr. J. Schuster. Revised by Mrs. J. Sadlier. New edition. Freiburg in Breaszan (Baden): B. Herder.

WE venture to predict that this book will continue to enjoy the popularity which we understand it has already attained. It is an elementary text-book, enriched with numerous and some very beautiful engravings, which will at once attract the attention of young pupils, and serve to impress upon their minds the many striking facts of Bible history. The chapters are short, and are written in a simple and pleasing style. Difficult words are explained at the foot of each page, the pronunciation of unusual words indicated, and a set of test questions attached to each chapter. It is about two-thirds the size of Reeve's well-known Bible history. The latter is fuller, more critical, and more suitable for advanced pupils; but Dr. Schuster's will, we think, be found equally useful, and certainly more attractive, as a text-book for schoolboys and schoolgirls, whose minds are not matured enough to appreciate the discussions on such questions as the interpretation of the six days of creation. It is not surprising, therefore, that this effort at simplifying and illustrating Bible history has been warmly welcomed by very many and distinguished prelates. The publisher of the book has been honoured by a letter from the Pope, in which his Holiness pays a high tribute to the character and design of the book. Cardinal Manning, in his letter of approbation, wrote: "The engravings are singularly good, and the book cannot fail to be useful in our schools." Its translation into all the well-known languages is another striking evidence of its excellence.

Though intended for the use of schools, it is more than a merely useful school-book. We agree with the Bishop of Mangalore, that it is a "work of no mean value for the elder members of the flock." Judged as a human document, and abstracting from its inspiration, the Bible is still acknowledged to be the greatest book ever composed. The histories of Joseph, Job, Saul, Ruth, Jonas, Tobias, Judith, Esther, and the Macabees, as contained in the Old Testament, not to speak of the more

sublime writings which make up the New Testament, have no parallel in human literature. Of the histories of the Old and New Testament, the little book is an excellent epitome. It must be therefore a valuable addition to the household literature of a Catholic family. It can be purchased in very neat binding for the modest sum of 1s. 3d.

T. P. G.

HOLY FACE OF OUR BLESSED LORD JESUS CHRIST.  
Eleventh Edition. By Very Rev. Dean Kinane, P.P.,  
Cashel. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS little book, which has had an immense circulation, is written in the characteristic fervid and devotional style of the author of *The Door of the Tabernacle*. It is a short and concise account of the origin and spread of the devotion to the Holy Face. Undoubtedly the worship of the Sacred Face, as the author remarks, is as old as the Church; for it is the worship of the Adorable Face of the Incarnate God; but an organized system of worship took shape at Tours, less than fifty years ago. The devotion was the approbation of the Holy See. Already the Confraternity of the Holy Face, established at Cashel by the zeal and piety of Dean Kinane, has over 20,000 members. In this age of infidelity and persecution of Christ's Church, devout souls can do much by way of reparation, and can discharge, in a manner, the pious office of St. Veronica, who with her veil wiped the Holy Face which was covered with spittings, with dust, with sweat and blood.

THE LIFE OF HUGH ROE O'DONNELL, PRINCE OF  
TYRCONNELL. By Lughaidh O'Clery. With Introduc-  
tion, Translation and Notes, by Rev. D. Murphy, S.J.  
Dublin: Sealy, Bryers and Walker, 1893.

FATHER MURPHY has rendered another signal service to Irish history and literature by his publication of the *Life of Hugh Roe O'Donnell*. In it we have a contemporary record of one of the most sadly interesting periods of our history. And Father Murphy's name is a guarantee that his share of the work is admirably done. The writer of the manuscript, now published for the first time, was Lughaidh O'Clery, a member of a family to whom Irish history and literature are deeply indebted, and the history of the manuscript itself is most interesting. Father Murphy gives it as follows:

Lughaidh left his books to his son Cucogry, who, "in 1632 was owner of lands in County Donegal, but he was dispossessed of them, being 'a mere Irishman,' and migrated with one of the O'Donnells to Erris, County Mayo; he carried his books with him. These, 'his most precious treasures on earth,' he bequeathed to his son, and so they passed on as a sacred inheritance from father to son, till they came to Patrick O'Clery, who brought them to Dublin, in 1817. This book was lent by him to O'Reilly, author of the *Irish Dictionary*, at his death, in spite of O'Clery's protest, it was sold to W. M. Mason. At the sale of his books by auction in London this manuscript too was sold; and some time afterwards, chiefly through the exertions of Mr. J. T. Gilbert, whose labours in the field of Irish history are so well known, it found a permanent home in the library of the R. I. Academy." And now, thanks to the zeal, patience, and able scholarship of Father Murphy, it finds a permanent home in the accessible literature of the country.

The text is beautifully printed, and copious foot-notes are to be found at every page. An excellent translation into English is given, which will enable those who do not understand the original to take in the contents of the book; but the student of Irish history will find Father Murphy's introduction "a regular mine of information on the period over which it extends." Here we have the abundant resources of a well-stocked mind set before us—information drawn from various sources, some of them hitherto unknown, others of them almost inaccessible—all worked into the narrative with admirable tact and system, thus giving us a life-like picture of O'Donnell's romantic career; and indeed, it would be difficult to find a romance so captivating as this plain prosaic history is: the treacherous capture of Red Hugh when a mere boy; his escape and re-capture; his second escape, after the almost indescribable sufferings of his imprisonment—all these are recorded on most unimpeachable testimony. His labours to unite his countrymen against the common enemy; his heroic adventures in union with O'Neill; the disaster at Kinsale; his voyage to Spain and its object; his disappointments and sad early death—all these form a history, compared with which most romances become mere common-place; and all this, and a great deal more, the reader will find in Father Murphy's most interesting and admirable book. To all Irishmen who love their country, its history and ancient language, we deem it a duty to say, "*get this book, read it, and preserve it.*"

LETTERS OF THE LATE FATHER GEORGE PORTER, S.J.  
ARCHBISHOP OF BOMBAY. London: Burns and Oates,  
1892.

THIS volume is made up of letters written by Archbishop Porter during the last ten years of his life; they were written principally from Rome and Feisole, and many of them from India, after Dr. Porter's elevation to the see of Bombay. The letters touch on most topics of any religious interest during this period; they are full of sound sense and accurate judgments, and they show a shrewd knowledge of men's characters and motives; a good many of them contain spiritual advice to persons who had sought it from the writer, and the advice will be found to be always prudent and appropriate, even to many others besides those to whom it was originally offered. It is needless to say that whenever the distinguished Jesuit touched on matters purely theological his statements are clear, able, and reliable. A good specimen of this occurs at page 99, where he states the doctrine of the *immaculate conception*. Though the volume is not a biography of Archbishop Porter, it gives, perhaps, a more faithful picture of him than would be supplied by even an elaborate biography; from his own mouth we can judge him here; from his own letters we get a true insight into his character, and all the more reliable inasmuch as the letters were evidently written without any view to publication.

The editors say, that they failed to secure several of Dr. Porter's letters, because "a not unnatural hesitation was felt by many to make public what they cherished as their own peculiar property."<sup>1</sup> It would have been better for Dr. Porter's memory if his editors had, in many cases, shown a like hesitation. We can, for instance, fully appreciate the following: "Allow me to make a Paddy answer."<sup>2</sup> "The Irish mind fails to take in proportions."<sup>3</sup> "I have just been laughing at a passage in a sermon."<sup>4</sup> The sermon referred to was preached in Rome by a distinguished Irish-American Archbishop, and contained an allusion to Veronica's napkin, as resembling the blood-stained banner of the Irish Catholic Church in the times of persecution. And Archbishop Porter, after "laughing" at the allusion, tells his friend, "the napkin of Veronica doing duty for the blackthorn tickles my fancy." This, no doubt, is very clever; but, after all, it is much easier to laugh at the distinguished preacher than to imitate that grand and stately eloquence which has

<sup>1</sup> Pref., page 7.

Page 116.

Page 312.

<sup>4</sup> Page 362.



made him famous wherever the English language is spoken. It was mistaken kindness of the editor to publish such passages—and there are many such in the volume—and it would be well to rectify the mistake in the improbable event of a second edition being at any time demanded.

J. M.

ACTS OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS. Hitherto unpublished.

By John H. Pollen, S.J. With a Preface by R. John Manis, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

THIS most interesting volume lets in a flood of light on the terrible sufferings endured for the faith by English Catholics under Elizabeth and her successors. It is, as the name implies, a series of authentic documents, setting forth the heroic constancy exhibited amidst cruel tortures by those whose names are recorded. In reading those plain matter-of-fact statements, one shudders at the wanton savagery of Elizabeth and her minions. At every page we see their *rabies* against the Catholic faith. The apologists of *The Virgin Queen* frequently tell us that in her reign Catholics were persecuted, not for their faith, but for their political conduct. This book affords a conclusive answer to that oft-repeated falsehood.

J. M.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY. By Dr. Schanz. Translated by Rev. M. F. Glancy and Rev. Dr. Schobel. Vol. III. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1893.

THE third and last volume of this learned and useful work is now published, and it more than realizes the hopes assured by the appearance of the preceding volumes. This volume is on the *Church*, and it treats the subject in a manner which leaves nothing to be desired. The importance of the *Church* treatise cannot be exaggerated. It is the very keystone of all religious controversy. The translators say very properly in their preface: "This is the master point from which alone we can survey the wide sweep of revelation." It is, therefore, of the highest importance to all that we should have in a language accessible to all so excellent a treatise on so vital a question. The volume is most learned and practical, and shows a most accurate acquaintance with all the recent phases of the controversy. And now that the work is complete in its English dress, English-speaking Catholics have reason to thank the learned translators for bringing home to them so useful, so admirable a work.

J. M.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

APRIL, 1893.

---

## DID MOSES WRITE THE PENTATEUCH?

TOWARDS the close of our last article<sup>1</sup> we replied to that difficulty against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch which is based upon the alleged conflict between various laws regarding the *place* of sacrifice. We there pointed out that our adversaries create this difficulty for themselves by forgetting the different circumstances which the various laws were designed to meet. If, during the first year of the wandering in the desert, before the tabernacle was erected, sacrifice might, according to the law, be offered in many places, and if, after the tabernacle was erected, sacrifice was restricted by law to one place, whether first at the tabernacle, or afterwards at the temple, where is there in this the shadow of contradiction?

But now we come to a far more serious difficulty, arising in connection with this same matter—the *place* of sacrifice. We have reconciled the various laws with one another; can we also reconcile their existence and promulgation from an early period with the history of sacrifice as handed down to us in the Old Testament? Impossible, our adversaries reply; for while the laws of Levit. xvii. 6, 9, and Deut. xii. 13, 14, restrict sacrifice to one place, the history of the Old Testament shows clearly that for centuries after Moses no such restriction was heard of, and sacrifice was freely, and

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Third Series, January, 1893, vol. xiv., pages 5, 7.

apparently legally, offered in numbers of places throughout all Palestine. Hence, they say, they are forced to conclude, in the face of the evidence which the historical books of the Old Testament offer, that the laws of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, prescribing one place of sacrifice, were never heard of, and were not indeed written, till many centuries after Moses.

“The pre-exilic period [says Dr. Driver] shows no indication of the literature of P<sup>1</sup> as being in operation. Thus the place of sacrifice is in P. strictly limited; and severe penalties are imposed upon any except priests who presume to officiate at the altar. In Judges and Samuel sacrifice is frequently offered at spots not consecrated by the presence of the ark, and laymen are repeatedly represented as officiating, in both cases without any hint of disapproval on the part of the narrator, and without any apparent sense, even on the part of men like Samuel and David, that an irregularity was being committed.”

Similarly, a learned writer in the *Dublin Review* of January of this year, summing up the conclusions of the “critics” on this point, says:—

“They can find no sufficient sign that before that time (the eighth century B.C.) the law prescribing unity of sanctuary was in existence. On the contrary, the practice of sacrificing in different places during the period from Moses to the reign of King Ezechias (728 B.C.) makes it difficult for them to suppose that such a law existed. The compilers of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings have recorded some instances of this practice. In some cases the instance narrated leads critics to infer that the sacrifice in question was not a solitary and exceptional event, but one of common usage. We will produce some of the instances which are usually brought forward. During the period of the Judges the house of Jehovah, or the ‘tent of meeting,’ which, according to the Deuteronomic law, would have been the only legitimate sanctuary for sacrificing, appears to have been at Silo. Yet we read that the people sacrificed at Bochim . . . and that during and after the campaign against the tribe of Benjamin, the Israelites gathered at Bethel, and offered their sacrifices and built an altar (Judges xx. 26, 28, and xxi. 2, 4). In neither of these two cases were the people censured for doing this. Of Judge Gideon, it is said that he built an altar at Ephra, where the angel of the Lord had appeared to him.” (Judges vi. 24.)

<sup>1</sup> P. is the *Priests' Code*, containing the law of Leviticus referred to above.

Many other instances of the same kind are adduced, and, as already stated, the conclusion of our adversaries is, that sacrifice could be legally offered anywhere; hence, that the law of Leviticus, as well as that of Deuteronomy, had not yet been heard of; and therefore that the *Priests' Code* and Deuteronomy were not written till a later period of Jewish history, long after the time of Moses.

We shall now endeavour to show that one, and only one, place of sacrifice was recognised by law all along from the erection of the tabernacle; and if we show this, it is plain that this whole difficulty vanishes at once. It will be necessary to treat this difficulty at some length, both because of its own importance, and still more because of the extraordinary weight attached to it by all our adversaries. We may conveniently divide the time from Moses to the Babylonian captivity into three periods: the first, comprising the time of Josue and the Judges from about 1444-1115 B.C.; the second, extending from the birth of Samuel, the last of the Judges, to the erection of Solomon's temple (1115-1003 B.C.); the third, from the erection of the temple to the Babylonian captivity (1003-606 B.C.).

Let us now turn to the Book of Josue, and see what we may gather from it regarding the unity of the place of sacrifice. We will not urge chapters xviii. and xix., though it certainly seems to be implied in xviii. 6, 8, 10, and xix. 51, that Silo was by law the one recognised centre of worship. But as our adversaries would, doubtless, reply that though these passages prove Silo to have been a religious centre, they do not prove it to have been the only place of sacrifice, we turn to the twenty-second chapter of the same Book of Josue. There we are told how the tribes of Ephraim and Gad, and half the tribe of Manasse after they had helped their brethren to subdue Palastine, set out to return to their own possessions East of the Jordan. And when they had come to the banks of the Jordan they raised an altar, and as soon as their brethren of the ten tribes heard that they had raised an altar, messengers were at once despatched to inquire what

(The exact length of the period is uncertain: we follow here the chronology of the *Historical Introduction to the Bible*, B. 1.



this *transgression* meant. But it will be necessary for our argument to quote the passage :—

“ And when they were come to the banks of the Jordan, in the land of Chanaan, they built an altar immensely great near the Jordan. And when the children of Israel had heard of it, and certain messengers had brought them an account that the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses had built an altar in the land of Chanaan upon the banks of the Jordan, over against the children of Israel, they all assembled in Silo, to go up and fight against them. And in the meantime they sent to them into the land of Galaad, Phinees, the son of Eleazar the priest, and ten princes with him, one of every tribe, who came to the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses, into the land of Galaad, and said to them: Thus saith all the people of the Lord: What meaneth this *transgression*? Why have you forsaken the Lord, the God of Israel, building a sacrilegious altar, and revolting from the worship of Him. . . . But if you think the land of your possession to be unclean, pass over to the land wherein is the tabernacle of the Lord, and dwell among us; only depart not from the Lord, and from our society, by building an altar besides the altar of the Lord our God. . . . And the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and of the half tribe of Manasses, answered the princes of the embassy of Israel: The Lord the most mighty God, the Lord the most mighty God, He knoweth, and Israel also shall understand: It with the design of transgression we have set up this altar, let Him not save us, but punish us immediately; and if we did it with that mind, that we might lay upon it holocausts, and sacrifice, and victims of peace-offerings, let Him require and judge. . . . God keep us from any such wickedness that we should revolt from the Lord, and leave off following His steps, by building an altar to offer holocausts, and sacrifices, and victims, beside the altar of the Lord our God, which is erected before His tabernacle.”<sup>1</sup>

In this passage we have a clear, and, as it seems to us, unanswerable proof that almost immediately after the death of Moses, while Josue was still alive, it was universally recognised among all the twelve tribes of Israel that there could be only one altar, only one place of sacrifice, and that “ the altar of the Lord our God, which is erected before His tabernacle.” We are well aware that our adversaries treat the Book of Josue like the Pentateuch, and contend that it is a patchwork production, much of which dates from a late

<sup>1</sup> Jos. xxii. 10-16, 19, 21-23, 27.

period: still they themselves confess that they are uncertain about the origin of this particular passage from which we are arguing.<sup>1</sup> In any case, even if we granted, or they proved, that this twenty-second chapter of Josue was written at a later period, we fail to see how it could affect our argument. For, let it be noted, our argument is based, not upon the personal beliefs or prejudices of the writer, but upon what, as an historian, he records regarding the *belief of all the Israelites in the time of Josue*. Hence, it will not help our adversaries to deny the authenticity and inspiration of the Book of Josue, they must also reject its historical authority before they can escape from our argument. So much for the evidence supplied by the Book of Josue. If now we turn to the Book of Judges, we find it stated that “the house of God (בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים)<sup>2</sup> was in Silo” (Judges xviii. 31), and that “there was an annual solemnity of the Lord in Silo” (Judges xxi. 19). And at the close of this period of the Judges, as we learn from the early history of Samuel, in the opening chapters of the first Book of Kings, Silo would seem to have been the one recognised place of sacrifice:—“There was a man of Ramathaim-sophim, of Mount Ephraim, and his name was Elcana . . . and this man went up out of his city upon the appointed days, to adore and to offer sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in Silo. And the two sons of Heli, Ophni and Phinees, were there priests of the Lord.” (1 Kings i. 1-3.) Thus throughout the whole period, from Josue to the last of the Judges, Silo, where the house of God stood was universally recognised as the one ordinary place of sacrifice.

We come now to the second period, extending over a space of about one hundred and fifty years, and we frankly confess that here there is considerably more difficulty. We are prepared to admit that during this time sacrifice was frequently offered in various places where neither the tabernacle nor the ark was present. Thus, of Samuel we

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Driver, *L. & of the O.T. Test.*, page 105.

<sup>2</sup> According to a common Hebrew idiom, the article prefixed, as here to the governed, affects the governing noun.

read that he built himself an altar at Ramatha, where he lived (1 Kings vii. 17); of David, that he went away from the Court of Saul to be present at a sacrifice which his family was offering at Bethlehem (1 Kings xx. 29); and of Absalom, David's son, that he went to Hebron for the purpose of sacrifice (2 Kings xv. 7). We readily admit, then, that sacrifice was, as a matter of fact, offered in many places during this period; but we would remind the reader that the question between us and our adversaries has regard, not to what actually was the practice, but to what should have been the practice *if it accorded with the law*. Now, bearing this in mind, and remembering also what we have proved for the earlier period, we fail to see how our adversaries can profit by our admissions in regard to this second period. For if in the earlier period sacrifice was confined to one place, it certainly must have been by an authoritative law, as the people would never have spontaneously restricted their liberty in a manner which entailed upon them long and weary journeys to the central sanctuary; and if by an authoritative law, this law can have been no other than that of Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

Prior to the second period, then, of which we are now treating, Leviticus and Deuteronomy must have existed, and it only remains to account for the practice of this period in the face of the stringent laws regarding the unity of the place of sacrifice which those Books contain. The explanation, we believe, is to be found in the fact that during this period the ark and the tabernacle were in different places; and thus there were at once two legitimate places of sacrifice set up: for it was always lawful to sacrifice not only at the tabernacle, but also wherever the ark, God's mercy-seat among His people, was present. Moreover, "the house of God," or tabernacle, was removed from Silo to different places; first, probably, to Galgala (1 Kings x. 8, xi. 14, 15); then to Nobe (1 Kings xxi. 1, 4, 7); and afterwards to Gabaon (3 Kings iii. 4, and foll.). The ark too was moved about from place to place, and seems to have been frequently in the camp, so that not only were there two sanctuaries for the time, but these sanctuaries were con-

stantly shifting their position. If we add to this the fact that there were two high-priests, one descended from Eleazar, the third son of Aaron, the other from Ithamar, Aaron's fourth son, it is not to be wondered at that confusion arose, and that looser notions regarding the place of sacrifice began for a time to prevail. In conclusion, we ought to bear in mind that the temporary non-observance of a law is a poor argument for its non-existence. He should show himself but a shallow historian who would conclude that because the law of clerical celibacy was not always observed, nor urged by the Popes before the days of Hildebrand, that therefore it had no previous existence. That the writers of this period omit to censure sacrifices which, in some cases at least, were most probably offered in violation of the Mosaic law, is indeed strange, we admit : but their silence is at best but a negative argument ; and are we, on the strength of this negative argument, and in face of the positive proofs of the contrary which we have advanced, to conclude that there was no law prescribing unity of sanctuary?

We pass now to the third period, extending from the erection of the temple to the Babylonian captivity (1003-606 B.C.), and we assert that from the time the temple was finished, it became the recognised centre of worship, the one legal place of sacrifice. Nearly a century before King Josias, under whom, according to our adversaries, the law restricting sacrifice to one place was first published, we find King Ezechias destroying the " high places " where sacrifice was wont to be offered :—" And he did that which was good before the Lord, according to all that David his father had done. He destroyed the high places, and broke the statues in pieces, and cut down the groves." (4 Kings xviii. 3-4.)

Earlier still in this period we find Asa and Josaphat, two kings of Judah, soon after the schism of the twelve tribes, and nearly ten centuries before Christ, endeavouring to destroy the high places where sacrifice was offered. " And Asa did that which was good and pleasing in the sight of his God, and he destroyed the altars of *foreign* worship<sup>1</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Therefore he destroyed not merely altars to other gods, but other altars to the true God than that legally recognised.



the high places." (2 Paral. xiv. 2.) Similarly, we read of Ezechias that "when his heart had taken courage for the ways of the Lord, he took away also the high places, and the groves out of Juda." (2 Paral. xvii. 6.) But the clearest proof that sacrifice was to be confined to the temple, is contained in the beautiful prayer offered by Solomon on the occasion of its dedication:—"Have regard to the prayer of Thy servant, and to his supplications, O Lord my God: hear the hymn and the prayer which Thy servant prayeth before Thee this day: that Thy eyes may be open upon this house night and day; upon the house *of which Thou hast said: My name shall be there.*" (3 Kings viii. 28, 29.)

The reference contained in the words italicised is to the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy, to which, therefore, let us turn. It is part of an address delivered by Moses to the assembled Israelites in the plains of Moab, immediately before his death and their entry into the promised land. In it Moses sets before the people the laws which they are to observe, and the spirit in which they are to observe them, when they have settled in the promised land:—

"You shall pass over the Jordan, and shall dwell in the land which the Lord your God will give you, that you may have rest from all enemies round about, and may dwell without any fear in the place which the Lord your God shall choose, *that His name may be therein.* Thither shall you bring all the things that I command you, holocausts, and victims, and tithes, and the first-fruits of your hands. . . *Beware lest thou offer thy holocausts in every place that thou shalt see. But in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes shalt thou offer sacrifices.*"<sup>1</sup>

Solomon, therefore, in referring to this passage, claimed that his temple was the place to which Moses had declared that sacrifice was to be confined; and without turning aside here to discuss the earlier or later date of Deuteronomy and of the Third Book of Kings, we are entitled to conclude, if there is any truth in the history, that he and "all the assembly of Israel" (3 Kings viii. 14) believed that the temple was henceforward to be the one and only legal place of sacrifice.

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xii. 10-11, 13-14.

Thus the whole history of Israel from Moses to the captivity clearly points throughout to a legalised centre of worship to which sacrifice was to be confined. In some cases, no doubt, this law was violated, though certainly not in all to which our adversaries refer. In many of them God may have dispensed in His law, because having honoured a particular place by revealing His majesty therein, He may have made it for the time a fitting sanctuary for sacrifice; or prophets and holy men like Samuel, David, and Solomon, may have been inspired by God to offer sacrifice in particular places. It is strange, we admit, that the sacred writers have hardly a word of rebuke for the violators of the law; but is it more reasonable, therefore, to conclude against a universal tradition, and the arguments we have advanced that there was no law restricting sacrifice to one place, than that, this silence notwithstanding, the law existed? The case of Elias, where he complains to God that various sanctuaries had been violated, is specially urged against us as proving that in his time there were many altars for sacrifice, all of them pleasing to God. "The children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant: they have thrown down Thy altars: they have slain Thy prophets with the sword." (3 Kings xix. 10.) But the answer is easy. The altars had been overthrown through hatred of the true God; and though they were unlawful, yet to tear them down *through hatred of God* was sinful, just as it would be sinful now to pull down an oratory through hatred of God, even though the oratory were not a lawful place for worship.

We pass now to another difficulty closely connected with the preceding. There was no distinction till ages after Moses, we are told, between priests and people; that distinction was introduced at a much later period, near the time of the Babylonian captivity. The historical books, it is said, prove clearly that in the beginning all the people offered sacrifice, and it was only at a later period that the distinction between priests and people began to be enforced after the *Priests' Code* was written.

In answer to this difficulty, we shall prove in the first place, that from the beginning priests were the legally

authorised ministers of sacrifice; and, in the next place, we shall make a few remarks regarding the sacrifices said to have been offered by laymen. That Aaron and his sons were specially consecrated to offer sacrifice, is proved from Levit. viii. 9:—"And when he (Moses) had sanctified and sprinkled the altar seven times, he anointed it and all the vessels thereof, and the laver with the foot thereof he sanctified with the oil; and he poured it upon Aaron's head, and he anointed and consecrated him. . . . he offered also the second ram in the consecration of priests" (Douay vers.) Lev. viii. 11, 12, 22. But as it will be said that these passages belong to the *Priests' Code*, and are therefore of no value to prove the early institution of the priesthood, let us turn at once to the historical books. In the time of Josue we find Aaron's son Eleazar (Josue xvii. 4) and his grandson Phineas (Josue xxii. 30) discharging the duties of high-priest. At the close of the period of the judges the same office was discharged by Heli and his sons, who were unquestionably descendants of Aaron; so that the office of high-priest still remained in the same family (1 Kings ii. 30). In the time of Solomon, the officiating high-priest, who was descended from Aaron's fourth son, Ithamar, was indeed deposed, and another named Sadoc appointed in his stead (3 Kings ii. 35); but the office of high-priest was not therefore transferred to another family; for this Sadoc himself belonged, like his predecessor, to the priestly family, being descended from Aaron's third son, Eleazar (1 Paralip. vi. 4-8). Now the descendants of Sadoc performed the functions of high-priest till the captivity: so that throughout the whole period of nearly a thousand years, from Moses to the captivity, the office of high-priest was confined to a single family. And just as the office of high-priest was confined to the family of Aaron, so the office of priest was confined to the same family, as is clearly proved by the conclusive evidence derived from the genealogical tables of the priestly families contained in the sixth chapter of the First Book of Paralipomenon. We are well aware that the "critics" object to the authority of the Books of Paralipomenon; but our answer is, that it has never been

shown, and never will be, that those books lack the authority of inspiration, much less of history. And now we have shown that from the days of Moses there was a legally established distinction between priests and people, and that the priesthood was confined to a single family, ages before the date to which our adversaries refer its institution and the promulgation of their *Hebrews' Code*. It only remains to say a few words regarding the sacrifices which are said to have been sometimes offered by laymen.

In the first place, it does not at all follow from the fact that priests were the ordinary ministers of sacrifice, that God would not, or did not, permit that on particular occasions it should be offered by extraordinary ministers. We read in the Book of Judges that Gideon and Manue, who were not priests, were not only permitted, but divinely commissioned to offer sacrifice. So too prophets of God, like Samuel, Elias, and Elisha, offered sacrifice, and were, doubtless, divinely authorised to do so; but it does not follow, by any means, that it was therefore competent for anyone to do the same. In the next place, it is essential to bear in mind, that not only the priest who offered the victim or other sacrificial offering, but also the lay person who supplied it, was said to offer sacrifice. Thus Moses was commanded by God to say to the people:—"The man among you that shall *offer* to the Lord a sacrifice of the cattle . . . shall immolate the calf before the Lord, and the priests, the sons of Aaron, shall *offer* the blood thereof." (Lev. i. 2-5.) In this way then the people were said to offer sacrifice, when they merely supplied the offering; and we believe that this will explain most of the texts adduced against us by our adversaries. Thus when "all the people" (1 Kings xi. 15), or, "the king and all Israel with him" (3 Kings vii. 62), are said to have offered sacrifice, the meaning is, that they supplied the matter of sacrifice, which was then duly offered for them by the priests.

There is another difficulty closely allied to the preceding.

In both cases it is the same verb **זָבַח**, and the same voice or conjugation, hiphil, that is used.



which we may notice here. It is said that whatever may be the fact regarding the distinction between priests and Israelites generally, at all events there was no distinction between priests and Levites generally till the time of Ezechiel; and hence the *Priests' Code*, which recognises the distinction, cannot have been written till about the same time.<sup>1</sup> To prove that there was no distinction between priests and Levites generally, and that all Levites acted as priests till the captivity, the forty-fourth chapter of Ezechiel is confidently appealed to:—"The Levites that went far from Me, when the children of Israel went astray, and have wandered from Me after their idols, and have borne their iniquity: they shall be officers in My sanctuary, and door-keepers of the gates of the house, and ministers to the house: they shall slay the holocausts, and the victims of the people. . . . And they shall not come near to Me to do the office of priest to Me, neither shall they come near to any of My holy things that are by the holy of holies: but they shall bear their shame and their wickedness which they have committed. . . . But the priests, and Levites (Hebrew text has: the priests, the Levites), the sons of Sadoc, who kept the ceremonies of My sanctuary, when the children of Israel went astray from Me, they shall come near to Me, to minister to Me."<sup>2</sup> (Ezech. xlv. 10-11, 13-15.) "From this passage," says Dr. Driver, "it seems to follow incontrovertibly that the Levites generally had heretofore (in direct conflict with the provisions of P.) *enjoyed priestly rights* (v. 13: for the future, however, such as had participated in the idolatrous worship of the high places are to be deprived of these rights, and condemned to perform the menial offices which had hitherto been performed by foreigners (vv. 10, f. 14): only those Levites who had been faithful in their loyalty to Jehovah, viz. the sons of Zadok, are henceforth to retain priestly privileges (v. 15 f.). Had the Levites not enjoyed such rights, the prohibition in v. 13 ('They shall not come near unto Me, to execute the office of priest unto Me') would

<sup>1</sup> Ezechiel was carried captive to Babylon about 595 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> We quote from the Douay version, which differs somewhat, but not substantially, from the present Masoretic text.

be superfluous. The supposition that they may have merely *usurped* them, is inconsistent with the passage as a whole, which charges the Levites, not with *usurping* rights which they did not possess, but with *abusing* rights which they did possess. If Ezech., then, treats the Levites generally as qualified to act as priests, and degrades them to a menial rank, without so much as a hint that this degradation was the restoration of a *status quo* fixed by immemorial Mosaic custom, could he have been acquainted with the legislation of P.?<sup>21</sup>

Our answer is: We have proved that the Pentateuch, including P. (the *Priests' Code*) was in existence ages before Ezechiel, and hence it will be enough for us here to give a probable explanation of the passage quoted from Ezechiel. We hold, then, that the Levites, who are represented in Ez. as rejected from the priesthood, are not the Levites generally, but these Levites who were at the same time priests and did not belong to the family of Sadoc. All the priests, except the descendants of Sadoc, had fallen into idolatry; and all except these were therefore to be degraded, and to perform in future the menial offices of simple Levites. This explanation is rendered more than probable, if we bear in mind that the sons of Sadoc were not the only priests; for it follows at once, that when the privileges of the priesthood were confined to the family of Sadoc, other priests, including at least all the descendants of Aaron's fourth son, Ithamar, must have been degraded. To the degradation, then, of these other priests, we hold there is reference in the passage of Ezechiel, quoted above, and there is absolutely nothing in the passage which cannot be explained in accordance with this view. It is absurd, then, to say that this passage proves, that it was only in the time of Ezechiel the distinction between priests and Levites was introduced, or that it was only then that the portion of the Pentateuch comprised in the *Priests' Code* could have been written.

We pass now from historical difficulties to a difficulty of quite a different kind, founded upon the difference of style

<sup>21</sup>See also *Duke's Review* of January of this year, where the difficulty is stated at length.

which is said to be evident throughout the Pentateuch. It is not merely, say our adversaries, that there are a few passages unlike the rest, but on close examination there is found to be a large number of passages, on the one hand most closely resembling one another in phraseology and general style; and, on the other, entirely different from the remainder of the work.

“If [says Dr. Driver] the parts assigned to P. be read attentively, even in a translation, and compared with the rest of the narrative, the peculiarities of its style will be apparent. Its language is that of a jurist rather than historian; it is circumstantial, formal, and precise; a subject is developed systematically; and completeness of detail, even at the cost of some repetition, is regularly observed. Sentences are cast with great frequency into the same mould; and particular formulæ are constantly repeated, especially such as articulate the progress of the narrative. The attention paid by the author to numbers, chronology, and other statistical data, will be evident.” . . . “J. [the Jehovistic writer] on the other hand, excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light; with a few strokes he paints a scene which, before he has finished, is impressed indelibly upon his readers’ memory.” . . . “If J. E.—and especially J.—be free, flowing, and picturesque, P. is stereotyped, measured, and prosaic.”

Our adversaries proceed to point out a number of expressions which they declare to be distinctly characteristic of P. Delitzsch enumerates eight such expressions; De Wette Schrader, twelve; and Driver, as many as fifty; and the conclusion, they say, to be drawn from all the evidence is, that it is impossible for any reasonable critic to regard the Pentateuch as the work of Moses or of any one writer.

Our first answer to this difficulty is, that an argument from style is in most cases very indecisive. Who, for instance, would seem to possess a more characteristic style than St. John the Evangelist, the apostle of charity? And yet we find the German Rationalists of the Tübingen School to-day contending, against the unanimous opinion of critics, that the first Epistle of St. John is so different in style that it cannot have been written by the author of the fourth Gospel. Again, the three Pastoral Epistles, which are

undoubtedly the work of St. Paul, differ very considerably in style from his other Epistles, upwards of three hundred words being used in them which he uses nowhere besides ; indeed so great is this difference of phraseology and style, that many of our German friends refuse to recognise the Pastoral Epistles as the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles. In the next place, we may be permitted to remark that Origen, Jerome, and the host of Jewish scholars, who examined the Pentateuch before and since the time of Christ, saw in it no such differences of style as would be inconsistent with a unity of authorship. But it may be said that it never occurred to them to doubt, and therefore they never examined the Pentateuch critically. But the reply will not explain the attitude of many modern scholars, who have examined all the arguments of the critics, and yet hold tenaciously to the view that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses. Among many such, we may point to the late lamented Archbishop of Edinburgh, Dr. Smith, a keen critic according to all, and a most profound Hebrew scholar and orientalist ; to the able and learned Jesuit, Cornely : and among Protestants, to the authors of the *Speaker's Commentary*, which declares that the peculiarities of style in the Pentateuch "are greatly magnified, if they exist at all."<sup>1</sup> The fact is, that arguments professing to be based upon style are very often propped up, if not built, by prejudice ; and men are liable to see one or more styles in a work in accordance with their pre-conceived opinions. In such a matter this is inevitable. Unless it be held that a writer is bound to confine himself always to the same vocabulary, and to write in the same way, no matter how his subject and circumstances may differ, it must in the greater number of cases remain a matter of uncertainty how far we are justified in concluding from a difference of phraseology or general style to a difference of authorship.

For ourselves, if we are to declare our own views, while we are far from believing the Pentateuch to be the elaborate mosaic which the minute and bewildering analysis of the

<sup>1</sup> *Speaker's Comm.*, i., page 28.



“critics” represents it; while we consider such analysis to be in many cases wholly unwarranted, and the merest guess-work, we are at the same time prepared to admit at once that there is considerable variety of style, and that possibly several hands are still traceable in the work. But do we, therefore, admit that Moses is not the author of the whole? Far from it. We contend, and have proved, that he is the author; but we also regard it as certain that he incorporated in his work pre-existing documents, leaving their phraseology and style unchanged.<sup>1</sup> Now, bearing this in mind, suppose we grant to our “critical” friends that three or four documents are still traceable in the Pentateuch. Why, we ask, may not Moses, guided by the Spirit of God, have made use of various documents, and incorporated them in his work, he himself adding the framework in which he set them, and giving unity and completeness to the whole? Our adversaries themselves hold that something of the kind is just what was done by a *later*<sup>2</sup> writer. But why by a later writer, and not by Moses? Different styles may prove different writers, but mere difference will prove nothing regarding the later dates of those writers, since there may have been many different styles before and during the time of Moses. If indeed it were proved that there is a style in the Pentateuch which is necessarily *later* than the time of Moses, then our adversaries would have scored a point; but mere difference of style, however great, we assert to be quite compatible with the Mosaic authorship, in the hypothesis that Moses incorporated in his work pre-existing documents.

But we shall be told that our hypothesis might perhaps explain the difference of style in Genesis, the history of which deals with events long antecedent to Moses, and on which, therefore, various documents may be supposed to have existed, but that it will not account for the same varieties of style in Exodus and the other Books.<sup>3</sup> But why not? Our adversaries assert this, but they do not prove it. Why may not Moses in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, have made

<sup>1</sup> See first article of this series in I. E. RECORD, June, 1892, page 181.

<sup>2</sup> See Driver, page 6.

<sup>3</sup> See Driver, page 149.

use of notes carefully prepared beforehand by scribes? Exodus deals with the events of the first year in the desert, Leviticus with the ceremonial laws which were given in the second year, and Numbers carries on the history from the second to the fortieth year. Now, why may not various documents have been prepared on the whole matter of those Books, and Moses in the fortieth year have thrown the whole into its present form, incorporating the various documents, and leaving untouched the distinctive style of each? Our adversaries have never answered why. In regard to Deuteronomy, the difference of style is sufficiently explained by the fact that the Book is made up of three orations delivered by Moses to the people; for the style is, therefore, naturally more oratorical. Finally, even if we admit that Josue presents the same peculiarities of style as the Pentateuch—a point about which there is room for doubt—can our adversaries show that the same scribe, who had prepared his materials for Moses, may not also have prepared them for Josue, who died seventeen years or less after Moses? Obviously the same scribes may have been still alive, and thus the same distinctive styles would be accounted for throughout the whole Hexateuch.<sup>1</sup> Thus, even if we grant to our adversaries all they ask regarding the variety of style, it seems to us that we can still claim for Moses the authorship of the Pentateuch, and for a different writer, whether Josue or someone unknown, the Book of Josue.

And now we have finished the work we set ourselves. We have proved, both by external and internal arguments, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. We have shown that an unbroken and unvarying tradition of more than three thousand years ascribes the work to him, and that internal evidence, direct and indirect, so far from contradicting, serves marvellously to confirm that testimony. We have examined the most serious difficulties, whether historical or literary, that have been urged against our view by German and English critics, and we hope we have shown that they

<sup>1</sup> This is the name given to the Pentateuch combined with the Book of Josue.

leave that view still unshaken, broad-based upon the unwavering tradition of ages. Much talent, much labour, much learning, has unquestionably been expended by our adversaries; but it is the old story of God's best gifts prostituted at the shrine of an unworthy system, that claims the sacrifice alike of history and of common sense, and calls it "scientific criticism." In the futility of the efforts of the "critics," notwithstanding all their ability and erudition, we behold another proof of the truth of the old saying:—

"Causa patrocínio non bona pejor erit."

JOSEPH McRORY.

### DANGEROUS READING.

**I**F the Holy Catholic Church has witnessed the rise and fall of so many nations and governments, if she alone remains ever fair and ever young, while everything around her blossoms, blooms, and fades, has not one of the chief causes, under God, been the vast number of her children, who, in every age, and in every state of life, have practised the preserving, incorruptible virtue of chastity? May we not, under divine Providence, attribute, in great measure, her unfading beauty and perpetual youth to her virgin priesthood, to the multitudes of her virgins and religious "whose steps the cloister guards;" to the number of her children in every rank of life, Christian fathers and Christian mothers, who by their steady devotion to their daily duties, their grave demeanour, their true piety, their severe morality, guard their own purity and that of others by their example and authority; and, though last not least, to the innocence and purity of Catholic youth, with whom, as with a chosen guard of honour, the Church has ever loved to surround herself? Thank God, no portion of the Church has been more faithful to Him, truer to the holy faith, than our own poor people. Their faith has shone undimmed through the gloom of ages, as the star shines serenely through clouds and storm. No breath of heresy has ever dimmed the faith of Ireland; and, under God, I would attribute this, in great

part, to the purity of her children. Here we have always had with that faith on whose whiteness no stain has ever fallen, that charming modesty, that simple purity, which has won the admiration even of foes. This angelic virtue still casts around the humblest cabin a halo of holiness, and still amidst the poverty and misery of the hovels of the poorest of our patient poor, springs and flourishes that fair and fragrant lily of holy chastity. It is a great trust, and a glorious heritage, which we have received from generations of saints. It is a noble legacy which the sons of Patrick and Columbkille, the daughters of Brigid, the Mary of Erin, have to transmit whole and entire to those who are to come after them.

But in our day, as never before, one great and growing danger threatens the ancient virtue of Erin. I allude to the flood of dangerous literature continuously pouring in upon our shores from England—immoral publications, newspapers, magazines, sensational novels, improper songs. Some of these cheap newspapers, now sold in every town and penetrating to remote villages, bear the very worst name. They are filled, week after week, with sensational fictions, reports of English police courts, and other dangerous matter, which should not be read by the pious and the pure, and which St. Paul says should not be so much as named amongst Christians. Those novels, what shall I say of them? Well, there are novels good, bad, and indifferent. There are some such as *Patricola*, by Cardinal Wiseman, and *Callista*, by Cardinal Newman, which show us what the early Christians were—the purity, the charity, the heroism of an Agnes, a Sebastian, a Pancratius, full of interest, instruction, and edification. Such also are the tales of Lady G. Fullarton, Miss Rose Mulholland, Mrs. Sadleir, and other Catholic writers.<sup>1</sup> Then there are novels which are bad. I need not speak of those which are openly infidel or immoral. There can be no mistake about them. The impure and scoffing demon leers out of every page of them. But there are those sensational novels, which the Catholic Church has

<sup>1</sup> For a list of such Catholic and readable writers, see *Irish Monthly*, vol. xiv., page 208.



ever discountenanced, which evoke sympathy with vice and crime, round which they throw a romantic interest, and which have been, and are, I doubt not, daily the cause of untold mischief to many.

We read in the Life of St. Theresa, that having been brought up piously, she almost lost herself by reading novels; and that the place in hell was shown to her, which had been prepared for her, had she continued that course. Novels which are opposed to holy purity, are, of course, forbidden by the Sixth Commandment. Some of these sensational novels, when dramatized and represented on the stage, are, from time to time, condemned even by the newspapers, in the severest terms as opposed to morality. How, then, can it be lawful to bring before the imagination by reading them those scenes, and those sentiments which it would be shameful to look on and listen to? Although, as Horace says:—

“*Segnius irritant animos demissa per aulam,  
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus:*”

still purity of thought must be preserved. The heart must be guarded as well as the eyes and ears; for, in reality, it is from the heart that all sin and all sanctity spring. By one unhappy act, “man’s first disobedience,” the happy harmony of our nature was set ajar; the war between the flesh and the spirit began. The fire of concupiscence was enkindled. No child of Adam, save her who was sinless all, is free from this strife. Now to read continually these sensational novels, is nothing else than to heap fuel on the fire within us. Such reading will never help us to

“Arise, and fly  
The reeling team, the sensual feast;  
Move upward, working out the beast,  
And let the ape and tiger die.”

Again, a large number of these novels are forbidden by the First Commandment, because they are written by the enemies of our holy religion. They speak with contempt of holy persons and things: they are filled with the grossest and foulest calumnies against the Holy Catholic Church, our mother. To continue to read such books, is to endanger, or at least to cool, the virtue of faith. Sometimes those who

are unconscious of evil think they are entitled to liberty. Some seek to persuade themselves that they are so securely entrenched in faith and virtue, that they cannot be moved by such reading. But gradually through these dangerous works they become accustomed to the modes of thought of unbelief. Error and vice lose for them their horror, and they come at length to look on their former fear and tenderness of conscience as bigotry, "the absurd name which impiety has invented for earnestness in religion." I have known the most fearful evil to follow from this indiscriminate reading. I have known it, with surprise and sorrow, to lead the holy, the fervent, the devout, to religious indifference, both in theory and practice. Large numbers of novels, then, are bad, being forbidden by the First and Sixth Commandments. There are others which, written by able men, giving an account of the customs and manners of other ages and other countries, helping us to clothe with living flesh the dry bones of history, may be indifferent, or useful. With regard to these it would be always right to obtain trustworthy advice.

It is no wonder that the Church, the gentle and tender nursing mother of our souls, should keep a careful watch over the intellectual nourishment of her children, should with her *indefatigable* seek to eliminate from it the poison of the soul. Hence the absurd cry that she is the foe of knowledge and intellectual liberty. The foe of knowledge she is not, but its guardian and its guide. Of knowledge the poet sings :—

"Half grown as yet, a child and vain,  
 She cannot fight the fear of death.  
 What is the soul from love and faith  
 But some wild Pallas from the brain  
 Of demons? lie her to bury  
 All having as her onward race  
 For power." Let her keep her place :  
 She is the second, not the first.  
 A higher hand must make her mild.  
 If all be not in vain, and guide  
 Her footsteps, moving side by side  
 With wisdom, like the younger child ;  
 For she is earthly of the mind,  
 But wisdom heavenly of the soul."

But what is the opinion of our most distinguished writers, our lords of human thought, regarding the vast number of what are called fashionable novels? Have not they also their *index expurgatorius*? One of the most famous English writers of our day<sup>1</sup> gives it as his opinion that there are great numbers of fools to be found in these countries, and his proof of this is the great number of fashionable novels which are yearly written, published, sold, and read in these kingdoms. Those who read these worthless and trashy books are, he says, utter fools; for fashionable novels are the literature of fools; they are the veriest trash. The same writer says: "Flimsy desultory readers, who fly from foolish book to foolish book, and get good of none, and mischief of all, are not these as foolish, unhealthy eaters, who mistake their superficial false desire after spiceries and confectionaries for their real appetite, of which even they are not destitute, though it lies far deeper, far quieter, after solid nutritive food."<sup>2</sup> And again: "There is a good kind of book, and a bad kind of book. I am not to assume that you are at all unacquainted with this; but I may remind you that it is a very important consideration at present. It casts aside altogether the idea that people have, that if they are reading any book, that if an ignorant man is reading any book, he is doing rather better than nothing at all. I entirely call that in question. I even venture to deny it. It would be much safer and better would he have no concern with books at all than with some of them. You know these are my views. There are a number, an increasing number, of books that are decidedly to him not useful. . . . I conceive that books are like men's souls, divided into sheep and goats. Some of them are calculated to be of great advantage in teaching, in forwarding the teaching of all generations. Others are going down, down, doing more and more, wilder and wilder mischief."<sup>3</sup>

On this subject of dangerous reading and bad books, the great old Johnson held a very decided opinion. Hannah More writes: "I never saw Johnson really

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle.

<sup>2</sup> Carlyle, *Advice to a Young Man*.

<sup>3</sup> Carlyle, *Address to the Students of the University of Edinburgh*.

angry with me but once, and his displeasure did him so much honour, that I loved him the better for it. I alluded, rather flippantly I fear, to some witty passage in *Tom Jones*. He replied: 'I am shocked to hear you quote from so vicious a book. I am sorry to hear you have read it; a confession which no modest lady should ever make. I scarcely know a more corrupt work.' I thanked him for his correction; assured him that I thought full as ill of it now as he did, and had only read it at an age when I was more subject to be caught by the wit than able to discern the mischief. Of *Joseph Andrews* I declared my decided abhorrence."<sup>1</sup> Can we have any doubt as to what the sturdy old moralist's judgment would be of the writers and readers of the fleshly sensuous school of poetry and fiction of the nineteenth century? Referring to the works condemned by Johnson, Thackeray once thanked God that in his day they had in a Charles Dickens a writer whose books he might, without doubt or fear, put into the hands of his daughters.

Now, even if those novels were not, as sad experience proves they are, dangerous, is it not a very serious thing to waste valuable time in reading the "literature of fools"? And what an amount of time given for other ends is wasted by those who spend their days, and some part of their nights, in reading those romances, rushing through them at railway speed, eager to get to the end of the folly. In order to derive advantage from the reading of a book, it is necessary to take one's time, look into it closely, get through it leisurely, and be able to give an account to ourselves of what wisdom or knowledge we have derived from it. Another evil effect of the constant reading of novels is to unfit us for the stern realities of life, to make us forget or despise those with whom we live, to get a distaste for our ordinary work, to make us undervalue or forget "that first, best portion of a good man's life, his little, nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love;" to close our ears to the real groans of our suffering friends and neighbours, "the still, sad music of humanity." One of the most famous writers of fiction

<sup>1</sup> *Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, by William Roberts.



and greatest thinkers of our time has well said : " Our fellow-mortals every one must be accepted as they are : you can neither straighten their noses nor brighten their wit, nor rectify their dispositions ; and it is these people amongst whom your life is passed that it is needful that you should pity, tolerate, and love. It is these more or less ugly, stupid, inconsistent people, whose movements of goodness you should be able to admire, for whom you should cherish all possible hopes, all possible patience. And I would not, even if I had the choice, be the clever novelist who could create a world so much better than this in which we get up in the morning to do our daily work, that you would be likely to turn a harder, colder eye on the dusty streets and the common green fields, on the real breathing men and women who can be chilled by your indifference, or injured by your prejudices ; who can be cheered and helped onward by your fellow-feeling, your forbearance, your outspoken brave justice."<sup>1</sup> If this time given to dangerous or useless reading were devoted to instructing the ignorant, to visiting the sick, to assisting the poor, to " learning the luxury of doing good," how much fruit, taintless, sweet, immortal, would it produce for us hereafter ? For let us remember that " it is not by books alone, or by books chiefly, that a man becomes in all points a man. Study to do faithfully whatsoever thing in your actual situation, there and now, you find either expressly or tacitly laid to your charge ; that is your post ; stand to it like a true soldier. Silently devour the many chagrins of it, as all human situations have many ; and see you aim not to quit it without doing all that *it* at least required of you. A man perfects himself by work much more than by reading. They are a growing kind of men that can wisely combine the two things—wisely, valiantly, can do what is laid to their hand in their present sphere, and prepare themselves withal for doing other wider things, if such lie before them."<sup>2</sup> Now, the continual reading of novels unfits one for all this, for the daily round of duty and business of life.

<sup>1</sup> George Elliott.<sup>2</sup> Carlyle.

Omnivorous devourers of fashionable novels would do well to encourage their real appetite for solid and nutritive food. Let them, when leisure allows, read books of travel or of biography, the most entertaining of all reading. By cultivating this appetite, which grows with what it feeds on, what delightful and interesting, and withal most profitable, reading would they find in the *Lives of the Saints*, the true heroes of our race, who, in truth, unselfishness, devotion to the poor and afflicted, self-sacrifice, heroic courage, surpassed the noblest dreams of poet or romancist. And in following the stories of those Christian knights, doing war with wrong, through the world-wide Church, they will see also "the cities and customs of many men." Read, for instance, Fr. Coleridge's *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, or the many beautiful volumes of the *Oratorian Lives of the Saints*. These indeed are stories

"In whose calm depths the pure and beautiful  
Alone are mirrored."

Read works like *The Life of Columbus*, by Washington Irving, and you will find a real heroine in his patron, the beautiful, devout Catholic, Isabella, the great and gracious queen, the saintly mother of a saintly daughter:

"Of her,  
That like a forest, long long twenty years  
About his neck, yet never lost her lustre:  
Of her that loves him<sup>1</sup> with that excellence  
That angels love good men with; even of her  
That, when the greatest stroke of fortune falls,  
Will bless the king."

What a contrast to her rival Anne Boleyn, and the worthy daughter of such a mother, Queen Elizabeth, as depicted by Miss Strickland.

"Past history, and especially the past history of one's own native country, everybody may be advised to begin with that. Let him study that faithfully; innumerable inquiries will branch out from it; he has a broad-beaten highway, from which all the country is more or less visible; then, travelling, let him choose where he will dwell."<sup>2</sup> The real

<sup>1</sup> *Henry VIII.*

<sup>2</sup> Carlyle.

masterpieces of fiction, the works of high art, which have become classic, and part of the abiding literature of any nation are, after all, few in number, and may, perhaps, be regarded as the complement of its history, and studied with it. They do not draw their interest from unlawful passion, unhallowed mystery, improbable crime, unnatural life; but from the lives and deeds, the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows, of the ordinary men and women of the times which they describe. In the choice of books, I have already said, that council should be taken by the inexperienced from wiser heads. Here there is great force in the old adage, "One man's meat is another man's poison." There is also the important distinction between general and relative danger. Few, however, will be disposed to deny that the English-speaking world has been the better for the works of him who has been truly described as the most popular novelist of the century, and one of the greatest humourists that England has produced, who has left us *Tiny Tim* and *Little Nell*. Of his great compeer, Thackeray, one who ought to be a judge, has said: "For myself, I own that I regard *Esmond* as the first and finest novel in the English language. . . . But if *Esmond* be, as a whole, our best English novel, *Colonel Newcome* is the finest single character in English fiction."<sup>1</sup>

I have already referred to George Eliot; and undoubtedly the works of these three writers will give to after generations some such knowledge of the English city and country life of this Victorian age as the plays of Shakspeare give us of the days of Queen Elizabeth. Of course in these authors the Catholic reader will meet from time to time things which will grate upon his feelings, and show him that even these great writers were not entirely above the prejudices which they have inherited as part of the false Protestant tradition regarding Catholic faith and practice which has become identified with English literature. But in them there is no false interest cast around vice to render it attractive. It is depicted in its true colours. The

sympathies of the reader are evoked for what is true, and innocent, and pure, for suffering and for sorrow. For works of highest art like these your thorough-paced novel-reader cares nothing at all. He is unable to relish their beauties or appreciate their excellence. In fact, he cannot read one of them through. His true appetite has been destroyed by the excitement of sensational stimulants.

I have been assured by men whose lives are devoted to severe mental toil, that at the end of a period of unusual exertion, they have found the over-taxed mind relieved and refreshed by the perusal of some tale or story. Such reading should form the amusement and relaxation of a leisure hour; should be as the sweetmeats, coming after the solid intellectual food. "I wonder," wrote Thackeray, "do novel-writers themselves read many novels? If you go into Gutter's you don't see those charming young ladies eating tarts and ices, but at the proper evening-tide they have good plain wholesome food and bread-and-butter. Can anybody tell me does the author of the *Tale of Two Cities* read novels? Does the author of the *Tower of London* devour romances? Does the dashing *Harry Lorrequer* delight in *Platin* or *Ringlets* or *Spongy's Sporting Tour*? Does the veteran, from whose flowing pen we had the books which delighted our young days, *Darney*, and *Richelieu*, and *Delorme*—by the way, what a strange fate is that which has befallen the veteran novelist! He is Her Majesty's Consul-General in Venice, the only city in Europe where the famous 'Two Cavaliers' cannot by any possibility be seen riding together!—polish the works of Alexander the Great, and thrill over the *Three Musketeers*? Does the accomplished author of the *Cartons* read the other tales in *Blackwood*? Does *Uncle Tom* admire *Adam Bede*? and does the author of the *Vicar of Wrexhill* laugh over the *Warden* and the *Three Clerks*? Dear youth of ingenuous countenance and ingenuous pudor! I make no doubt that the eminent parties above named all partake of novels in moderation—eat jellies—but mainly nourish themselves upon wholesome roast and boiled."

J. J. KELLY.



THE POLICY OF THE POPE.<sup>1</sup>

SELDOM has the cloak of anonymity been thrown round such a doubtful piece of literary morality as the essay on the policy of Leo XIII., which the *Contemporary Review* admitted into its pages some few months since (October, 1892). We shall have to look back to the anonymous diplomatic pamphlets of Napoleon III., who made belief to protect Pius IX. with one hand, whilst secretly stabbing him with the other, if we would find anything like a parallel to the treachery, misrepresentation, and, shall I say it? conspiracy, that are but half masked under the flowing style of the present literary diplomatist. His object is the same as that which the diplomatico-literary hacks of the French Emperor and of Cavour had in writing up the revolution (1856 to 1870), the only difference being that they looked to the future, to a fact to be accomplished, while our "liberal Catholic" aims at the maintenance of the work wrought out by his predecessors. He belongs, as Father Brandi in his able answer assures us, to the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic corps. Like the Imperialist and Cavourian pamphleteers, who by their profuse throwing of dirty ink contributed so effectually to the foundation of the kingdom called *United Italy*, this loyal son of the Church and faithful subject of Leo XIII. has his principals and fellow-workers in certain "eminent colleagues," by whose "exhortations" he has been "emboldened to endeavour to favour the cause<sup>2</sup> at the risk of hurting the susceptibilities of its most accredited representative." No one can fail to recognise the old unctious style of hypocritical ethical glow, the same bawling tone about progress, the same staled accusations, the same appeals to a spurious

<sup>1</sup> See "The Policy of the Pope," *Contemporary Review*, October, 1892. "Leon XIII. devant l'Allemagne Par Heinrich Geffcken, ancien ministre résident, conseiller privé de Berlin." Paris, 1892. "La Politica di Leone XIII., e la *Contemporary Review*, Esame Critico di Salvatore M. Brandi, S.J.," Roma, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> What cause? Of Catholicism? We have a difficulty in seeing how that can be, since the whole paper is a piece of *special pleading* by one who holds a brief for the Triple Alliance *against the Pope*.

patriotism, the same show of tinsel regard for the interests of the people—"the newly-awakened masses,"—the same mock invocations to the spirit of religion.

The object of our foreign diplomatic contributor to English magazine literature is to discredit the action of the Pope before the English-speaking world, and especially in the eyes of France and Ireland. He is evidently the mouthpiece of a political party, and that party consists of the ephemeral statesmen of the Triple Alliance. These men, animated largely by sectarian hatred for the Pope, have determined, it seems, on a new war of misrepresentation and calumny against the Holy See, in the hope of diminishing, if not of utterly destroying, the beneficial effects of the wise and conciliatory policy of Leo XIII. They see the danger to their system of gigantic militaryism or bayonet-propped power, if his influence is allowed to grow, mature, and fructify. Therefore it is that his policy is radically mistaken, dangerous to the true interests of the Church and of the State.

There is a spice of peculiar spleen running through the entire production of the Austro-Hungarian diplomatist, which at once tells the reader that the action of our Holy Father is being weighed, not in "the impartial scales"<sup>1</sup> of a loyal and devoted son of the Church, as the English reading public are asked to believe, but according to the very questionable standard of morality adopted by Machiavellian statesmen of the Cavourian school. It is this characteristic which makes our author contrast so unfavourably with another diplomateo-antipapistical pamphleteer, Henrich Gelfeken,<sup>2</sup> former resident minister and private counsellor of Berlin, a "colleague," no doubt, of the

<sup>1</sup> Page 157.

<sup>2</sup> This gentleman is either a plagiarist or a forger/black, who has done our English magazine-writer into French, or else the two have drawn their supply of misrepresentation from a third common source. No one can fail to notice at the first glance the likeness of argument, literary treatment, authorities, documents, and parasitology. It is curious to note that the name of *Signor Crispi* should have been the potent influence which moved this gentleman to take up his pen against Leo XIII. (page 139), and to substantiate his attack by quotations from an English magazine of documents of which he shows he knows not the import.

contributor to the *Contemporary*. Mr. Stead, to whom the author of this tirade against the Pope seems to me to owe a great deal of his inspiration in the main line of his arguments and ideas, does not show any of that keen spite of an abettor of the Italianissimi which peers through the ill-concealing rags of the *Contemporary's* professions. His submissive filial devotion to "a venerable and beloved superior" is seen in his writing of the "idiosyncracies and weaknesses of the man"<sup>1</sup> in a Protestant review, which enjoys such a wide circulation in and out of England, but especially among non-Catholics and men who are most liable or most ready to conceive suspicion and hatred against the Holy See. Pope Leo XIII., to this model and loyal Catholic, is "an idealist fashioned in the mould in which religious enthusiasts are cast," possessing "a will that neither bends nor breaks,"<sup>2</sup> fawningly accommodating and bland to the great, though sincere in his love and pity for the masses, no doubt; contrasting strangely with Pius IX., who refused to consider his duties as Pope incompatible with his sentiments as an Italian.<sup>3</sup> "*Our Holy Father*" is an egoist, who merges all other interests into his own, who has allowed the "social theologico-scientific evolution in the Church's activity," -so loudly called for "by the trend and goal of modern civilization" (*Review of Reviews*!) to be barred and "blocked" by "obscure local incidents" which have "imparted to her (the Church's) progress a purely political direction."<sup>4</sup> He has changed

<sup>1</sup> Page 459.

<sup>2</sup> Page 458.

<sup>3</sup> This is conveyed in an innuendo (page 459). And this of Leo XIII. ! the most loyal Italian of his time. True, he considers the Papacy the first glory of Italy; true, he issues letters against the destructive work of a government of Freemasons (see Letter to Italian people, December 8, 1892, which breathes throughout the purest patriotism); true, he cannot acquiesce in a régime established by *foreign* revolutionists, *foreign* bayonets, and *foreign* daggers, in contravention to all the rules of right and international law; true, he does not pocket the hard-won money of the peasants, and travel about at their expense, nor does he aim at making "his Italy" the heaviest taxed country in Europe; he does not cripple its industries by a cruel conscription, nor ruin them by bank crises! What then?

<sup>4</sup> Page 458.

"the bitter struggle with our enemies" [query, what enemies?] into cordial friendship—friendship which "bade fair to merge into political alliance;" "he has made solid sacrifices for shadowy benefits"—in a word, has made purely political success the end instead of the means."<sup>1</sup> "But what strikes one more than all his other mental characteristics is his absolute singleness of purpose."<sup>2</sup> In pursuing "what may prove in the end to be a mirage in the sandy desert, if not a will-o'-the-wisp hovering over a Serbonian bog."<sup>3</sup> For his one absorbing ambition, "the key-note of the Pope's policy"—the one object of "all the compromises he has made, and all the sacrifices he has imposed upon his spiritual children since his election"<sup>4</sup>—"is the restoration of the temporal sovereignty of the supreme head of the Catholic Church, to the interests of which he imagines it to be absolutely indispensable."<sup>5</sup> He has made the Catholics of every nation "the instruments for the regaining of his power."<sup>6</sup> For this he sacrificed by silence the Poles to the Emperor of Russia, "the greatest enemy of the *Triple Alliance*;" for this he favoured and fawned on the French Government, which is atheistical and inimical to every interest of our religion. In short, because of the obstinately selfish policy of the Pope all Christianity is convulsed and menaced by dissensions and war.<sup>7</sup>

To this low estimate of the policy of Leo XIII., by a Catholic, I at once oppose a more just and more honest appreciation by a Protestant;<sup>8</sup> and I ask the reader to note the points of likeness as well as the divergence between the two accounts.

"As some men never have any divine call that leads them to discharge duties outside their own doorstep, so some Popes have never recognised the existence of duties incompatible with their primary fealty to the local interests of the Italian town in which they have spent their lives. That which distinguishes

<sup>1</sup> Page 458.

<sup>2</sup> Page 459.

<sup>3</sup> Page 477.

<sup>4</sup> Page 459.

<sup>5</sup> Page 459.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. p. 477. Where the inverted commas occur I am quoting the exact words of the *Contemporary*.

<sup>8</sup> Mr Stead, *Letters from the Vatican*, chapter iv., page 42.



Leo XIII. is that before his mind there has passed a vision of a higher and nobler ideal than that of being the mere temporal master of the Eternal City. He has seen, as it were in a dream, a vision of a wider sovereignty than any which the greatest of his predecessors had ever realised, and before his eyes there has been unfolded a magnificent conception of a really universal Church. But no sooner has he gazed with holy ecstasy on the world-wide dominion which lies almost within his grasp, than he turns with a sigh to the older and smaller ideal of the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which has bounded the horizon of so many of his predecessors, and which presses upon him like the atmosphere of the whole of his waking life. These are the two dreams, the two ideals, hopelessly antagonistic one to the other : but Leo helplessly clings to both."

There is a marked similarity of thought, expression, and even phraseology between this effusion and the corresponding paragraph of the article in the *Contemporary*. Can it be that a Catholic has stooped to copy the style and text of a flippant Protestant journalist in speaking of his *Father, his venerable and beloved superior, and the guide of his conscience*?<sup>1</sup> The tone of splenetic attack adopted in the magazine article, its evident purpose to injure and defame the Pope, make this suspicion not unjust; through the sheep's clothing involuntary appear such ugly claws, that we must perforce conclude the ravening wolf within. Again Mr. Stead speaks :—

"And here it may be observed in passing, that, however absorbing may be the influence of Roman politics on the Holy See at the present moment, when the restoration of its temporal sovereignty is but a theory or an aspiration, it is nothing to the distraction that would follow if the Pope were to be cursed with the burden of a granted prayer, and set up once more on the throne of Rome."

And again we have to notice the same argument, the same mode of expression, the same phraseology in the *Contemporary* : "a curse rather than a blessing," "the curse of a granted prayer."<sup>2</sup>

But the autocrat of Reviews does more justice to our Holy Father's policy. He finds that Leo XIII. has a "second vision," "infinitely more sublime than the restitu-

<sup>1</sup> Page 457.

<sup>2</sup> Page 460.

tion of the unimpaired sovereignty of the Papal See over all the ancient patrimony of the Church.”<sup>1</sup>

“Leo has dreamed of being really the Pastor of the world, in fact as well as in name. To be Vicegerent of God, and therefore representative of the Father of all men, is to stand in *loci parentis* to all the human race. The Church, the Lamb’s Bride, is the mother of humanity. As head of the Church, he must care with a mother’s love for all the children of the family. It matters not that many are orphaned from birth, knowing not of their divine parentage. It is for him to teach them of the Fatherhood of God, and to prove to them by infinite acts of helpful service the reality of the motherhood of the Church. No difference of creed, no blindness of negation, no obstinacy of unbelief, can shut out any human soul from the loving care of the shepherd to whom God has entrusted the guardianship of His flock. Humanity wanders in the wilderness; he will be its guide. The forces of evil abound, making sad havoc of the forlorn children of men; he will stand in the breach, and cast the shield of divine grace and of human service over the victims of the Evil One. Men are ignorant; he will teach them. They are groping in the dark; he will lead them into light. Up from the void everywhere rises a despairing cry, Who will show us any good? And from the recesses of the Vatican palace he answers, ‘I will conduct you into the paths of all peace.’ It is to establish the city of God in the hearts and the lives of men, not in the future or beyond the grave, but here and now, that he has been called to the Papal throne. Not from any mere lust of power and personal ambition, but with a genuine aspiration to be helpful to mankind, Leo dreams of re-establishing on a wider basis and a surer foundation the spiritual authority of Innocent the Third and of Gregory the Seventh. He feels himself called to make the Holy See once more the active and omnipresent embodiment of the conscience of mankind.”

Out of these three attacks on Leo XIII.’s policy—Geffcken’s, the *Contemporary’s*, and Mr. Stead’s—it is evident at first sight which is most honest and which nearest the truth. The anonymous “Catholic” sees everything through the spectacles of the Triple Alliance, and, as a consequence, the area of his vision into the clear expanse of the Pope’s wisdom is cramped by spite and prejudice: he can only see in all the acts of the Pope’s religious policy an insatiable avarice for power and influence—a greedy

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Letter*, page 13.

searching for a new temporal power by interference with the domestic policy of nations. The Lutheran, Geffcken, seems to dislike, after Bismarck—his great enemy and jailer—no one so much as the Pope, and does not hesitate to quote garbled documents, which he cannot have examined for a moment, but has evidently taken on faith from some “colleague” performing the *role* of primer, in order to give some appearance of plausibility to his accusations and arguments. Let us take one instance out of many to show our Lutheran friend’s scrupulous care in the use of documents. After arguing that Leo XIII. in France, in Ireland, in Germany, in Russia, in Austro-Hungary, has simply attempted to make Papal Infallibility an all-grasping monster, swallowing up the political independence of Catholics, on the plea that politics is only morality applied to the social acts of governments and the public life of peoples, he thus proceeds:—“On voit jusqu’ a quel point on etend au Vatican la sphere des questions morales. Boniface VIII., en declarant dans sa Bulle *Unam Sanctam* que le glaive temporel doit etre tire seulement *ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis* n’aurait pas dit mieux.” It is a very unfortunate thing for the doctor that he should have chosen to practice on so well-known and highly-prized a Bull: “*pat experimentum in corpore vili et ignoto*” should have been whispered into his ear by his good genius as he penned the unfortunate sentence. Everyone who has ever read the document knows that Boniface VIII. is speaking not of the *sword* in general, but of the *Church’s sword*, which, he tells us, she allows to remain in the hands of kings and soldiers to be used only at her bidding. “*Nam dicentibus apostolis, ‘Ecce gladii duo hic,’ in Ecclesia scilicet, cum apostoli loquerentur, non respondit Dominus nimis esse sed satis. Uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiae, spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis. Sed hic quidem pro Ecclesia, ille vero ab Ecclesia exercendus. Ille sacerdotis, is manu regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis.*” Therefore, Boniface VIII., so far from arrogating the sword to himself, is, in reality, disclaiming the personal *use* by the Church of that sword which Christ gave her. Boniface VIII. taught as clearly as Leo XIII. now teaches, that the State

and the Church are distinct societies, each perfect *in its own order*;<sup>1</sup> that, consequently, the Church by the will and bounty of her founder "adjumenta ad incolumitatem actionumque suarum necessaria *omnia in se et per se possidet*," and, therefore, exercises over secular affairs a power which falls short of *direct*, is something more than simply *directive*, and by theologians has been called *indirect*. Only a limited class of secular affairs, then, falls within the sphere of the Pope's prerogative, and *that* not because they are secular—not *ratione sui*—but by reason of their strict inseparable connection with the ultimate end of man—*ratione finis Ecclesie*—because they touch the interests of religion, and are bound up with the principles of morality. The Austro-Hungarian diplomatist and Dr. Geffcken might have read all this in nearly every encyclical of Leo XIII.; and, had they possessed that extensive acquaintance with Catholic theological documents and authorities with which the cursory reader might credit them, they would have found this system of Church jurisdiction to have been upheld by the morally universal consent of theologians,<sup>2</sup> as well as clearly expressed in innumerable Papal documents.

It was precisely this position which Innocent III. took up when William, Count of Montpellier, wrote (1202) to ask the Pontiff to legitimize his children. In the decretal

Leo XIII. *Ubi scilicet* Decret. "Deus hominigeniti prout rationem inter duas potestates partitur, scilicet ecclesiasticam et civilem, alteram qualem divinus altissimus in hunc mundum praeceperit. *Unusquisque est in suo campo, cuiusque potestas in proprio terminatur, quibus confine sunt, utramque, easque singulimodo, et alterius potestatem non confundimus*; necesse aliqui veluti circumscribitur, in quo sua cujusque actio jure proprio versetur." Cf. S. Thos., *De regim. princ.*, lib. i., c. xiv. "In tantum saecularis potestas est sub spirituali, in quantum est ei a Deo supposita *scilicet in his, quae ad divinae actionis pertinet*." "Illa in his magis est obediendum potestati spirituali, quam saeculari. In his autem, quae ad bonum civile pertinent, est magis obediendum potestati saeculari, quam spirituali, secundum illud. Mat. xiii. 12. *Beati qui vultis habere pacem, qui se ab omni saeculo abstinete*." One would have supposed that this *Ubi scilicet* might have constituted the necessary sufficient Catholic instruction to know that this doctrine is a commonplace of the Church's teaching. On the question of the connection between Church and State, in regard to which this gentleman shows such grave misconception, I may be allowed to speak in another paper.

<sup>1</sup> S. Aug. *De Civit. Dei*, l. v., c. xxiv.; Innocent III., Decret. *Novit*; S. Th. Aquin., ii. ii., 60 a 6 ad 3um &c.; Joan. Turrecremata, l. ii., c. 100-102, 113-116; Bellarmine, *De potestate Summi Pontificis*, c. 100-101.



*Per venerabilem* he replied, that the matter, in so far as it was purely secular, belonged to the authority of the King of France; but, he added, “*etiam in aliis regionibus, certis causis inspectis, temporalem jurisdictionem casualiter exercemus* ;” that is to say, the Church has the power of jurisdiction over spiritual matters *primarily* and *principally*, while over temporal affairs she has a *real* but *indirect* power, as it were *secundario et ex consequenti*. And the same Pontiff, in his decree *Novit*<sup>1</sup> (1204) —published to put a stop to the quarrels between England and France—thus writes: “*Non intendimus judicare de feudo, cujus ad ipsum spectat judicium . . . sed decernere de peccato cujus ad nos pertinet sine dubitatione censura, quam in quemlibet exercere possumus et debemus* ;” which words are explained by the *Uam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII.: “*si deriat terrena potestas, judicabitur a potestate spirituali*.” Precisely these principles have been followed by our Holy Father in all his political intervention. Let his own clear statement suffice to prove this: “*Nous ne cherchons pas,*” he wrote to the Bishop of Grenoble (June 22, 1892), “*à entrer sur le terrain politique, mais lorsque la politique se trouve étroitement unie aux intérêts religieux, comme cela arrive actuellement en France, si quelqu’un a la mission de déterminer la conduite qui peut sauvegarder efficacement les intérêts religieux, dans lesquels consiste la fin suprême des choses, c’est bien le Pontife Romain.*”

To turn now to Mr. Stead’s account of Leo XIII.’s policy. There is misconception in his account, no doubt; but he is not so blinded by passion and prejudice as to accuse the Pope of ambition. His great mistake lies in this: he is a *dissenter*, at this present moment engaged in the advocacy of disestablishment in England, and, naturally, the habitual attitude of his mind has led him too far a-field in his generalizations. The Roman States are not England, and the Church *Universal*, embracing two hundred and fifty

<sup>1</sup> The text of this decree is garbled and misrepresented in the pages of Gefleken (page 55). On the significance of the decretals *Per venerabilem* and *Novit* of Innocent III. see Jungmann, *Dissertat. in Hist. Eccl. ast.*, tom. v., pages 365-385, where also are answered objections against that Pope’s policy which are almost the exact counterpart of the present carping at Leo XIII.’s action.

million souls, stands on a different footing from either the Church of England or the Synagogue of dissent. Our Holy Father has always claimed that the free unfettered action of the Holy See is the great source of salvation for European society. So far from "the two dreams, the two ideals"—as Mr. Stead gratuitously nicknames the spiritual and temporal supremacy of the See of Peter—being hopelessly antagonistic, they in reality form but one closely colligated history in the past, and in the present a firmly-welded chain of unyielding principles.

Let the story of Europe witness at once to the necessity of the freedom of the Sovereign Pontiff, and to the benefit, which every nation derived therefrom. An unimpeachable authority shall speak for us here:—

"Le système catholique au moyen âge [wrote Aug. Comte,<sup>1</sup> who was certainly no great friend of the Papacy] forme jusqu'en le chef-d'œuvre politique de la sagesse humaine. Le génie, éminemment social, du catholicisme a surtout consisté, en constituant un pouvoir moral distinct et indépendant du pouvoir politique proprement dit, et sans qu'aucunellement prêtre ait jamais été le maître de la politique, à laquelle [jusqu'à] lors la morale avait toujours été au contraire essentiellement subordonnée. Quand on examine aujourd'hui, avec une impartialité vraiment philosophique, l'ensemble de ces grandes contestations si fréquentes au moyen âge, entre les deux puissances, on ne tarde pas à reconnaître qu'elles furent, presque toujours, essentiellement défensives de la part du pouvoir spirituel, qui, lors même qu'il recourait à ses armes les plus redoutables, ne faisait le plus souvent que lutter valamment pour la limitation convenable de la puissance temporelle, et pour la sauvegarde de sa propre mission."

The times when, according to this writer, might and political astuteness prevailed over right and simple truth, when the dominant class ground down their inferiors, when rank militarism choked up every land—such times, or worse, are nigh at hand, or even now upon us. And just as then a St. Gregory I., a Leo III., a Gregory VII., an Alexander III., an Innocent III., wielded the temporal power as a divinely-

<sup>1</sup> *Cours de philosophie*, Cf. Leo XIII., *Innocentius Dei*, "Quod Europa Christiana," &c.

granted lever, to raise up the world to the height of Christian truth and Christian morality: so now our Holy Father Leo XIII. has been appointed by God to regain that power and apply it as "a divine provision for the maintenance and order of the Christian world," as the only solution of the conflicts by which the civil order of the world is broken, the only preservation against the rising flood of revolution.<sup>1</sup> The "mother idea" of Leo XIII.'s policy is contained in the dictum of St. Augustine, which is made the introduction to the Encyclical *Immortale Dei* (Nov. 1, 1885), that though the end of the Church is primarily and directly spiritual, yet so great are the worldly blessings flowing from her influence that she could not do more for the material interests of mankind had she been instituted simply for the advancement and protection of temporal prosperity.<sup>2</sup>

That these principles have ever guided our Holy Father, even before his elevation to the Chair of St. Peter, may be seen from his conduct and writings while Cardinal Bishop of Perugia. Let us follow him step by step through a Pastoral Letter on the Temporal Power of the Holy See, addressed to the people of Perugia, in 1860. He commences by declaring the various catchwords and phrases, which the revolutionary agents were introducing among his people in order to seduce them from their allegiance to the Holy See, among the most culpable of maxims—in their substance heretical, and of a nature to upset the order and economy of the Church. The treacherous means and deceitful disguises of the enemies of the Papacy made him fear that, were he to neglect to strip off the mask they had assumed, he would one day have to reproach his conscience in the words of the prophet (Is. vi. 5): "Vae mihi quia tacui."

Many of the revolutionists had said in suave accents, that there was no question of religion; that they willed religion to be always respected; that the spiritual government of

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Pope*, page 235, a work which we pray may come to be read more widely and attentively by such men as Mr. Stead.

<sup>2</sup> See Father Brandi, S. J., *La Politica del Papa*, part I. Of this work there is now a good French translation, by M. Vetter, published by Lethielleux.

souls was enough for the Sovereign Pontiff, but the temporal power was wholly unnecessary; nay, they continued--almost in the very words of our three pamphleteers--the absorbing influence of worldly cares on the Pope's mind was prejudicial to the Church, contrary to the Gospel, and condemned by the doctrine he professed. "And they go on repeating other insanities of the same kind," wrote Cardinal Pecci, "in which it is difficult to distinguish what is pure shameless folly from insult or from the cynicism of hypocrisy." He then briefly notes the strange claim these men put forth in order to rob a lawful possessor of all that was not absolutely necessary to his existence, and the cruel irony of telling him in the midst of the work of spoliation that they are only seeking to relieve him of the weighty cares which his property involved. "Let us not dwell on the august rights which have, as it were, consecrated, for eleven centuries, the most ancient and the most venerable of monarchies: for if these rights are not enough to secure the respect of all nations, there is not a kingdom or empire in Europe that may not be at once destroyed." He calls the confiscation of all the possessions, which the piety of the faithful and of princes had bestowed on the Roman Pontiff and the Catholic Church, a piece of gigantic brigandage. He foresees and deplors the triumph of the revolution over the most venerable and sacred authority, "*the authority which is the corner-stone of all the European edifice.*" It would be no less than an iniquity to destroy that monarchy, which has in all times been the home and shelter of science and art, *the fountain-head of the civilization of nations.* Let us say nothing about the iniquity of demolishing the bulwark which saved Europe from oriental barbarism, the power which founded Christian Rome, the throne before which the crowned heads of the most powerful monarchies bowed, and to which representatives of all nations flocked, even from the extremities of Japan, to offer their homage and submission. But the one grand consideration, which he would have his people fix well in their minds, is that the spoliation of the temporal domain of the Popes would have for its consequences a notable detriment to Christianity and the Catholic faith.



It must not be imagined that the necessity of the territorial sovereignty of the Popes is a dogma of the Catholic Church.<sup>1</sup> But no intelligent man can fail to see the real and most strict connection which exists between the temporal power and the spiritual primacy, whether one considers the primacy in itself or in the free exercise to which it is entitled. It is necessary to the Papacy *non quoad esse* but *quoad bene esse*.<sup>2</sup>

We suppose that the anonymous Catholic of the *Contemporary* knows and believes that Jesus Christ in founding His Church, wished to make her a principle of life and a pillar of truth in the world, which He had regenerated; and therefore, in order to perpetuate in her the authoritative teaching which He had brought from heaven, gave to the Prince of the Apostles and to his successors the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole body of the faithful. The man who should refuse to hold and confess that the Roman Pontiff is the father and chief of all Christians; that to him was entrusted, in the person of Peter, full authority to feed, direct, and govern the entire flock of Christ—his Church universal—would thereby reject the plain teaching of Scripture and tradition,<sup>3</sup> and cease at once to be a Catholic. This granted, does it not immediately follow that to subject such an authority, which God has established on earth, in a concrete form, as the divine

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Manning, writing two years later, says:—From the whole episcopate of the Church has come one universal acclamation of *faith* in the temporal sovereignty of the Vicar of Jesus Christ as a *divine institution upon earth*. The consent of the pastors and their flocks witnesses to this deep Catholic instinct, and the voice of the episcopate raises it to a judgment of the Church, and furnishes the material for a more solemn utterance" (*ibid.*, page 236). And in a note he quotes Bellarmine to the effect that ten councils have recognised the temporal power: "Si hæc non est Ecclesiae Catholicae vox, ubi obsecro eam inveniemus" (Bellar. *ibid.*, pp. 836-845). Surely the Catholic who should run counter to all this must incur some note of censure?

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Father Brandi, as above.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Denzinger, *Enchirid: Symbol. et Definit*, nn. 1668-1671: "Nulli sane dubium," says the Vatican Council, "*imo sæculis omnibus notum est, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, apostolorum princeps, et caput fideique columna, et Ecclesiae Catholicae fundamentum, a domino nostro Jesu Christo. . . . claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctae Romanae sedis, ab ipso fundatae, ejusque consecratae sanguine vivit et praesidet et judicium exercet.*" Cf. Decrees of Council of Florence, *ibid.*, n. 589, &c.

principle of truth, of holiness, and of salvation, to the whim of purely human power, would be to run counter to right reason? Besides, is it fitting that the living interpreter of the divine law and will should be the underling of the civil power, to which he lends all its force and stability—the civil power, which when not inspired by that sacred guide, is nothing better than brute force and individualistic caprice?

The Universal Church is the kingdom of Christ, and shall the visible head of that kingdom be the inferior and subject of the powers of this world? Such an idea implies an ignorance of the basis and construction of Christian society, wholly inexcusable in an educated Catholic. It is absolutely unreasonable that he whose mission it is to guide all men towards their final end should be placed under the power of those who have to busy themselves merely with secondary and intermediate ends that serve only as means to the end supreme. The proper order of things does not allow the architect to be the lackey of the artisans engaged in executing his plans, nor the general-in-chief to be at the nod and beck of his colonels and inferior officers, nor the sovereign to be the servant and subject of those who have been set over isolated branches of the government and administration. For the order and harmony of everything must correspond with the order of the ultimate end of everything; or, as St. Thomas puts it, "*unius cujusque rei quæ est propter finem, necesse est quod forma determinetur secundum proportionem ad finem*;"<sup>1</sup> and hence we deduce the well-known rule, "*ordo potestatis est sicut ordo finium*." Just as, therefore, it would mean a total confusion of the most elementary ideas, to pretend that the end ought to be subordinate to the means, so it would be equally senseless to say that he who is charged to secure the end ought to be subject to those who are charged to procure the means.

Now the happiness of this life, which is more or less in the hands of secular rulers, and constitutes the end of their power, is naught but a means for the attainment of happiness eternal. It is this happiness which is the ultimate end of

<sup>1</sup>i., ii., q. xcv., a. 3.

society as well as of each individual, and it is this happiness which can be secured to mankind, *ordinarily* at least, only by the government of the great Pontiff, who has received from Jesus Christ the mission to guide the nations to their highest destiny of eternal glory. How perverted, then, are all true Christian notions, when it can be boldly asserted that the Roman Pontiff, the chief supreme of the Church Universal, should be made dependant on any earthly potentate!

Having thus seen how incompatible with the very notion of the spiritual primacy of the Holy See is all subjection of the Pope to secular authority, let us now pass on to consider the necessity of the temporal power for the free exercise of the duty and office of Supreme Pastor and Father of Christendom. The Pope, in this capacity, has to keep the deposit of faith intact, to preserve revealed truth pure and incorrupt, *for all the faithful*, who are members of that great body which is spread among all the peoples and nations of the universe. Consequently, he ought to have full liberty of communication with his bishops, princes, and people—with all his subjects, so that his word, which is the organ and expression of the Divine Will, may penetrate everywhere and be everywhere canonically promulgated without let or hindrance. Now, subject our Holy Father to any government whatever—let alone a rank freemason's lodge, packed with the bitterest enemies of Christianity—and what will become of the freedom necessary for the exercise of his apostolic ministry? His *non licet*, or some decision he may give, will soon irritate those who claim him as their subject: he will very speedily frustrate some political design of his masters, who will as promptly invoke reasons of state to justify menaces, laws, prison, exile, in order to stifle at the very outset the voice of truth. It is almost superfluous to appeal to history to prove this in the persons, for example, of Liberius, of John I., of Martin I., and of Pius VI., and Pius VII.

But, in truth, prison and exile would be no longer necessary in order to tie the hands of the Pope, once he became the dependent and subject of the civil power. It

would be easy for the government, even by indirect means, to withdraw the means of communication, to close the channels of publicity, to put obstacles in the way of the diffusion of truth, and to give free flow to calumny and falsehood. Little, perhaps, did Cardinal Pecci surmise, as he wrote all this in 1860, that he himself, as Leo XIII., would experience the very evils which he was declaring to be the necessary consequences of any attempt to subject the Pope to secular government.

The revolutionists and Piedmontese diplomatists knew full well that, by striking at the temporal power, they would be better able to aim a blow at the spiritual authority. Their end, their avowed object, was to wage a war of extermination against the spiritual and temporal authority of the Sovereign Pontiff: "They wish to make the exercise of his spiritual supremacy impossible," wrote the Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia, "to tear the royal sceptre from his hands, that thus they may prevent his using the keys. Their desire is to prevent the head of Christianity from exercising his indispensable influence on the mystic body of the Church; which would be, in reality, to rob the Church of her life."

"Non volumus, non possumus, non debemus," is the only answer the Popes have ever given, and must ever give, to all menaces, and to all wily overtures made to induce them to surrender their temporal rights and possessions. And every Catholic, worthy of the name, requires from them, and has a right to require from them, this unvarying and inflexible answer, no matter what kings or people unite to deprive the Holy See of its independence. "Obstinate old man," cry the friends of the Triple Alliance. "Glorious defender of sacred principles and of our liberty," calls in response the Catholic world; and, in thousands, the sons of the Church flock round the feet of their Father, eager to kiss the hands of the time-worn champion of their highest, their eternal interests, and to gaze on that saintly face, whose steadfastness has stemmed for the while the tide of modern barbarism, wherein the demon of revolution sought to swallow up the civilization of Europe. On that blessed



“obstinacy” depends all that Catholics hold most noble, dearest, most sacred: our conscience, our faith, our happiness, here and hereafter. For, as our Holy Father proclaimed as early as 1860, were the Holy See, which is the permanent dwelling-place and infallible chair of truth, according to the promise, *ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem seculi* (Matt. xxviii. 20), were the Holy See subjected to foreign influence and foreign domination, the obedience of its children would become difficult, and at times well-nigh impossible. The waters of saving truth would never, indeed, be poisoned or polluted, for not all the concentrated venom of hell can infect or stain their crystal purity: but who shall tell what diabolical arts and methods for intercepting the health-bringing stream would be practised by the enemy as it flowed from its untainted source? And would they who came to drink increase in eager confidence, because of their knowledge that foes had seized and held the fountain-head? Every Catholic demands, therefore, and has a right to demand, that in an affair of such supreme moment—an affair which concerns not so much the interests of the present life as those of immortal souls—every Catholic demands that the decisions, which are to be as a lamp to his feet on the pathway to heaven, should be so far free and unfettered in their expression as to leave no room for the slightest suspicion that they are due to either foreign influence or to pressure and violence. The Pope must be placed in a position notoriously such that his independence may be not only safeguarded, but plain and manifest to the eyes of all the faithful of the universe.

In this democratic age, freedom of elections is generally considered the sacred right of every society; but how secure the free election of the Pope—the head of the largest and most important society on earth—when the throne of Peter is overlorded by emperor, king, or sovereign people, and surrounded by their creatures? And are there no modern Pilates, is there no Caiaphas, in these days, before whom the Sovereign Pontiff might be mocked with the vain formalities of justice, as of old was his Lord whom he represents?

Of what use is it to talk of guarantees? It is undeniable

that by the enemies of the Holy See the ruin of the temporal sovereignty was regarded as a stepping-stone to the destruction of its spiritual authority. "The ruin of the temporal power,"<sup>1</sup> wrote Mazzini, in 1850, "evidently brings with it for the human mind the emancipation from the spiritual authority of the Church." And long ago, Frederick II., writing to Voltaire,<sup>2</sup> as if he had but the work of man to deal with, predicted the necessary emancipation of nations from the spiritual power of the Holy See, if once the temporal crown were stripped from the tiara. "On pensera à la facile conquête des états du Saint-Siège pour avoir de quoi fournir aux dépenses extraordinaires : et l'on fera une grosse pension au Saint Père (!) Mais qu'arrivera-t-il ? La France, l'Espagne, le Portugal, en un mot toutes les puissances Catholiques ne voudront pas reconnaître un vicaire de Jesus Christ subordonné à la main impériale. . . . Petit à petit, chacun s'écartera de l'unité de l'Eglise, et l'on finira par avoir dans son royaume sa religion comme sa langue a part." Vain it is to adduce the lying words and promises of Cavour—that subsistent lie—for his deeds are his interpreters ; and his so-called *verbal note* to Walewski and Clarendon on the 27th of March, 1856, proves that, in pulling down the temporal throne of Pius IX., his ultimate aim was to crush out the universal spiritual primacy of the Holy See. His note was, to use the words of a Liberal paper of Geneva, "a solemn cry of reprobation against the Pope, a programme of war against the Papacy, both spiritual and temporal," "Italy, or rather Piedmont, from the outset," writes The O'Clery ;<sup>3</sup> "carried on a determined warfare against religion, and the revolution proved itself not only anti-Catholic, but anti-Christian : " bishops were exiled and imprisoned, or prevented from communicating with Rome ; the publication of Papal encyclicals was forbidden ; Church property was confiscated indiscriminately ; civil marriage and the secularisation of education were enacted ; ecclesiastics were bound

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in the Archbishop's Pastoral from the *Globe* of August, 1850, and the *Pensiero ed Azione*.

<sup>2</sup> Also quoted in the same Pastoral from the *Correspond. de Voltaire*, xii., page 99.

<sup>3</sup> *The Making of Italy*, pages 369 and 380.

to submit to conscription. "The final end of this monstrous enterprise," are the ringing words of Leo XIII. in 1859: "Is that of Voltaire and the French revolution—the total annihilation of Christianity. The plan of the conspiracy is clear to anyone who will not voluntarily shut his eyes to the facts of evidence. . . . It will be executed by affirming, protesting, swearing, that they do not wish to touch, or in any way injure religion." The mask since then has been thrown off very generally. The northern Italian masters of Rome have not exactly cast the successor of St. Peter into chains, but they have allowed it to be said with impunity in the chamber: "The Papacy is the cancer of Italy;" they have tampered with his correspondence; they have encouraged a miserable rabble to attack and insult his sons, who came from distant lands to honour their common father: they allow and approve of any anti-Papal or anti-religious demonstration: they erect and guard day and night a Giordano Bruno monument, and yet will not protect a peaceful Catholic society, wishing to place a wreath on the bust of Christopher Columbus; they have dragged before their tribunals causes which belong to the Pope alone: they are seeking to introduce a yet more sweepingly anti-Christian measure for civil marriage, and allow or encourage the increase of all manner of incentives to immorality; Catholic journalists are fined and imprisoned for the simplest protests, or their papers are sequestered: but the *Messaggero* and other such agents of evil, are permitted to heap filth and abuse on Pope and cardinals, priests and nuns, without any impediment: and Rome has been filled with a mob, which needs but the voice of the "Old man of the Vatican," or a motion of his pen to stir them to fury and insults—a mob which would not spare even the ashes of a dead Pontiff! The Grand Orient of Italy and his servile crew are never tired of threatenings, and it is not too much to say that they are only waiting for a favourable opportunity to invade the Vatican in the same way as they invaded the Pontifical States in 1870. Who will talk of *guarantees*, when *Phylloxera*, *Jotha* and Masonic hate are to be their foundation?

We will conclude with an exhortation and a warning—

both, in their substance, from the pen of our Holy Father.

Let all faithful Catholics increase their faith in the grand mission and ultimate triumph of the Holy See. We are in the midst of a perilous transformation of Christian society. But we must remember that "we have an immovable kingdom," around which the idle winds of revolution howl and rage only in obedience to the will of God, who wishes men to learn, from the strength and yet the impotence of the storm, the stability of His rock-founded city. Already there are clear signs that the nations of Europe, wearied with violence and corruption, and sickened with insecurity, are beginning to look to the old centre of equilibrium. Amid the fluctuations of kingdoms, empires, republics, confederations, the Papacy, forming a perpetual contrast, has stood immutable. The Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, has watched for well-nigh nineteen centuries the rise and growth of every movement of humanity, and has repeatedly been called on to guide and to create, to recognise and to fashion, new forms of Christian society, new arrangements of European order. What has been so often in the past, will be once more; and, by Divine Providence, will speedily return the full recognition of the twofold prerogative of the Chair of St. Peter—its spiritual primacy and its temporal sovereignty, whereby through so many ages it has ruled the destinies of the world. "God wills it," we cry, for through persecution the Holy See has ever entered on a bright era of glory. Out of what men call failure, by struggle and conflict, the Roman See has ever wrought victory. The present war against its temporal prerogative and the existing usurpation have served to define and publish that prerogative in a clearer light, to accentuate its necessity, and to deepen the resolve of the faithful to unite in its defence. The imprisonment of the Vicar of Christ—the physical, I say, but still sterner moral imprisonment of our Holy Father, has evoked the most marked expressions of devotion from the Catholics of all nations, and foremost among the sons of the Church to venerate and defend their Father, are, and have ever been, the Irish people. The enemies of the Pope are our enemies, as they



were our fathers'; and what our fathers did we are eager to do again, if need were, in order to uphold the great principles to which we have been always faithful. "The hand of God," we know it, "has planted so firmly the unshaken rock of St. Peter, that the efforts of its enemies have served and will serve unto the end only to procure for the Church new victories and new triumphs."<sup>1</sup> Our confidence and our faith are undying and unbounded, for they rest, not on natural considerations, not on the worldly-wise reasoning of secular statesmen, but on supernatural principles, and on the promises of God Himself.

The warning, with which we conclude, is directed against weak-kneed Catholics, who have not stamina enough in their faith to resist the paltry reasonings of earthly policy. "There is no possible middle course," wrote Leo XIII.,<sup>2</sup> "between those who are devoted to us and the revolutionary enemies of the Papal throne. We must be either with Christ and His Vicar, with the Church and its visible head, that is to say, with the Roman Pontiff against his enemies; or with the latter, and against God and the Church. There is no longer a question of politics; it is a matter of conscience. We are not permitted to hesitate between Christ and Belial; to do so would be to make ourselves mean and disloyal in the eyes of men, odious and culpable in the eyes of God: 'Qui non est mecum, contra me est.'"

A. HINSLEY.

<sup>1</sup> These are almost the very words of the Pastoral, which we have been following throughout.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

## “ ALLELUIA.”

THESE is, perhaps, at first sight, nothing more mysterious throughout the whole history of that mysterious organization which we call the Church than the undoubted influence, the extraordinary fascination, exercised from the earliest times over the minds of men by the old Jewish cry of *Alleluia*. Compounded of two Hebrew words, *Allelu*, to sing or celebrate, and *Jah*, the abbreviative of the ineffable Name, Jehovah, a name which every Jew regarded with the deepest awe and veneration, what wonder is it — especially in later times, when Palestine was under the heel of a foreign power, and the voice of patriotism, always more keenly heard in the day of misery and oppression than in times of freedom and prosperity, adding her entreaty to that of religion, bid him gather up and cherish the remnants of a language once spoken by his ancestors, but which had long since ceased to be the common vernacular of every-day intercourse, forgotten in the days of captivity and shame — what wonder is it, that the tongue of the devout Jew loved, with longing expectancy, to form the old triumphant sound which his forefathers had uttered, and thus to hymn the God who had promised a Saviour to Israel; or that, when he knew that the Saviour had already come, and when he had enrolled himself under his banner, and had become a citizen of the New Jerusalem; that with the old anthem he should continue to hymn the God who had so graciously fulfilled his promise: in a word, that when he became a Christian, he should bring *Alleluia* with him from the synagogue to the church, and that he should communicate his enthusiasm for the jubilant cry of the older Hebrew worship to his new Gentile brethren?

But this was not all; independent of its time-honoured association with Hebrew faith and Hebrew patriotism, the word *Alleluia* was endeared to Christians, as well to those of Jewish origin as to those in whose veins there flowed no drop of Abraham's blood, by other and even still holier ties. For was it not, as they believed, the canticle with

which the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, that land which was one day to be their eternal home, were wont to hymn the triumph of the Lamb? Had not the evangelist St. John, rapt to heaven, heard myriads of angels singing it in the courts of heaven itself?

Stimulated, therefore, by the time-honoured traditions of the old faith, and the mystical association of the new; on the one hand, by the half regretful memory of the Jewish convert, who regarded his beloved *Alleluia* as the one connecting link which bound him to the past—the talisman which unrolled before his mind’s eye the picture of his country’s vanished glory; and, on the other, by the jubilant expectation with which all men, Jew and Gentile alike, looked forward to singing it one day in the heavenly fatherland, *Alleluia* spread from mouth to mouth, and became, so to speak, the common watchword of Christendom. Everywhere, in the early days of the Church, was “*Alleluia*” heard. Before the invention of bells, it served as a signal to the faithful to unite in prayer. Fishermen made the seashore ring with it. The field labourer solaced his toil by joyously repeating it. The very animals on the country side, at least so it seemed to the devout ears of St. Paulinus, burst forth with the universal cry. *Alleluia*, says the saint, “*novis balat ovile choris.*”

Strange stories, too, of miracle and mystery added to the glamour with which the sacred word was associated. From time to time mysterious voices were heard chanting it in the air. Sozomenus tells us how a voice was heard singing “*Alleluia*” in the temple of Serapis, and how those who heard it foretold what afterwards actually came to pass, viz., the conversion of the heathen temple to the worship of the true God. Fortunatus, of Poitiers, relates how St. Germain, Bishop of Paris, extinguished a fire by simply singing “*Alleluia* ;” and the priest Constantius, in his life of another St. Germain, recounts how, in the fifth century, the saint taught the Britons to use it as their war-cry, especially on one notable occasion, when they gained a great victory over the Picts and Scots. St. Gregory the Great, then, was quite in harmony with the spirit of his age when, auguring

the speedy conversion of the English from the name of the Yorkshire king, Ælla, he foretold that "Alleluia" should soon be sung in England.

Thus the awe, and the reverence, and the love with which Christians regarded the ancient Hebrew cry of jubilation, increased from day to day, till at last so great a fascination did it exercise on men's minds that, carried away by their naïve piety, and that spirit of poetic mysticism so characteristic of the middle ages, they actually went the length of endowing "Alleluia" with a personality, nor could they see her depart from the liturgy at Septuagesima without bidding her a solemn and lingering farewell.

The venerable Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours from 1125 to 1133, or thereabouts, that great pillar of the Church—"Magna ecclesiae columna," as St. Bernard calls him—has left us, in a sermon for Septuagesima Sunday, a most beautiful explanation of this strange custom.

"This day [he says] which is, as it were, the gate of the fast, which takes away from us the song of gladness, even 'Alleluia,' through the whole course of its office expresses lamentation and penance, teaching us that we ought to cease from immoderate joy, and remain in the tears and mourning of penitence.

"We, therefore, repeat her name again and again, and even address Alleluia herself, as though we were desirous of retaining her as our guest, saying, 'Abide with us this day also, O Alleluia, and to-morrow, when the sun shall have arisen thou shalt go thy way;' and then we give her our last farewell, and say, 'May the good angel of the Lord be with thee, and bring thee back to us again.'

"And this we do, that we may know that we shall not have perfect joy until, refreshed by the body and blood of the Redeemer, we receive with gladness that song."<sup>1</sup>

Before, however, proceeding further with this most interesting subject, it may be well to inquire, first of all, at what period the word Alleluia was actually incorporated into the Church's liturgy.

St. Jerome, speaking of the interment of his sister Fabiola, tells us of the psalms they sang during the

<sup>1</sup> *Venerabilis Hild. Opera*, page 296. Beaugendres' edition, published by Le Conte. Paris, 1708.



ceremonies, and how the sacred vaults rang again with Alleluias. “Sonabant,” he says, “psalmi, et aurata templorum reboans in sublime quatiebat Alleluia.” The singing of the *Alleluia* after the Gradual—the Alleluistic verse, as it afterwards came to be called—was, according to St. Gregory the Great, first introduced into the Roman Mass by Pope St. Damasus I., who ruled the Church from 366 to 384. “Ut Alleluia hic diceretur de Jerusalemorum Ecclesia ex B. Hieronymi traditione, tempore memorie Damasi Papae traditur tractum”<sup>2</sup> Previous to his day, the sacred word was not, indeed, unknown in Western liturgies, but it was only sung on Easter Sunday. What St. Damasus did, was to extend its use to the whole year, even to funerals.

St. Gregory, in his turn, forbade that it should be sung between Septuagesima and Easter, and either at this period, or somewhat later, it was altogether banished from Masses of Requiem and from Dirges; that is to say, so far as concerns the West, for in the Eastern Church the custom of singing Alleluia throughout the year and at offices for the dead has never been abandoned. It is not until nearly two hundred years later, that we find any record of Alleluistic offices. Amalaire Fortunatus, Deacon of the Metropolitan Church of Metz, and compiler of a celebrated antiphonary, is one of the first to speak of them. He tells us that in his day, the ninth century, they used to celebrate an office of the Alleluia at Metz, which was “like to joyous obsequies, as it were a kind of solemn farewell.”

From Metz the custom seems to have spread, with Amalaire's antiphonary, to the rest of France, and even beyond the Rhine. Indeed, the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, held in 817, enjoins it in the German dioceses. At a very early date, also, the same custom seems to have found its way into Spain, for the Mozarabic liturgy, which in the eleventh century, during the Pontificate of St. Gregory VII., was superseded, except in one or two obscure churches, by

<sup>1</sup> Lib. I., Ep. 63. See Granelas' *Anciennes Liturgies*, vol. i., page 504. Paris, 1699.

<sup>2</sup> *De Ordoni Antiphonarii*, liber c. 30. See Granelas, vol. i., page 311.

the Roman rite, contains a farewell to *Alleluia*, and one which is most beautiful. Dr. Neale gives a translation of it in his *Mediæval Hymns*, which in default of the original, we venture to lay before our readers :—

*Cyprian.*—Alleluia in heaven and on earth ; it is perpetual in heaven, it is sung on earth.

There it resounds everlastingly ; here sweetly.

There happily : here concordantly.

There ineffably ; here earnestly.

There without syllables ; here in musical numbers.

There from the angels ; here from the people.

Which, at the birth of Christ the Lord, not only in heaven, but on earth, did the angels sing : while they proclaimed, “ Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will.”

*Benedictions*—Let that Alleluia which is ineffably sung in heaven, be more efficaciously declared in your praises. Amen.

Unceasingly sung by angels, let it here be uttered brokenly by all faithful people. Amen.

That it, as it is called, the praise of God, and as it imitates you in that praise, may cause you to be enrolled as denizens of the eternal mansion. Amen.

*The Lauda.*—Thou shalt go, O Alleluia ; thou shalt have a prosperous journey, O Alleluia.

*R.* And again with joy thou shalt return to us, O Alleluia.

*V.* For in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest thou hurt thy foot against a stone.

*R.* And again with joy thou shalt return to us, O Alleluia.

It is possibly by way of Spain that the Alleluiatic farewell entered the Low Country ; but, however this may be, certain it is, that in the sixteenth century the canons of St. Donat's at Bruges, sung Alleluiatic vespers on the Saturday preceding Septuagesima Sunday. Their last adieu, too, is very beautiful. We have culled it from an ancient service-book preserved in the Bruges Municipal Library. The psalms are the ordinary psalms of Saturday ; but by way of antiphon, Alleluia is repeated three times before each of them. The little chapter is adapted from Hebrews x. 22, 23 : *Accedamus ad Deum in vero corde et plenitudine fidei, teneamus spei nostræ confessionem ; fidelis enim est qui repromisit.* Then follows a responsory, similar in form to those which we sing at Matins. The hymn is one of great beauty. It is not peculiar to the Bruges office, but was at

one time sung generally throughout France, and probably in the churches of various other countries also.

Dr. Neale's beautiful translation has, of late years, regained for it some of its former popularity; but, strangely enough, in a quarter where, in the Middle Ages, the hymn was little known. The name of the author is uncertain, and even the approximate date of its composition is very doubtful. Helmore attributes it with some hesitation to the eleventh century; but Neale is of opinion that in all probability it is of no earlier date than the thirteenth. Several versions of the hymn are extant, but those we have seen differ from one another but very slightly. The following is the Bruges reading. It is not quite the same as that from which Neale made his translation:—

Alleluia dulce carmen  
 Vox perhennis gaudii,  
 Alleluia laus suavis  
 Est choris coelestibus  
 Quam canunt Dei manentes  
 In domo per saecula.

Alleluia laeta mater  
 Concinit Hierusalem;  
 Alleluia vox tuorum  
 Civium gaudentium:  
 Exules nos flere cogunt  
 Babilonis flumina.

Alleluia non meremur.  
 Nunc perhenne psallere:  
 Alleluia nos reatus  
 Cogit intermittere:  
 Tempus instat, quo peracta  
 Lugeamus crimina.

Unde laudando precamur  
 O, Beata Trinitas,  
 Ut tuum nobis videre  
 Pascha des in aethere  
 Quo tibi laeti canamus  
 Alleluia perpetim.

Amen.

The *V.* and *R.* are thus indicated with characteristic brevity: “*V. Alleluia ter.*”

The Antiphon to the *Magnificat* is most appropriate: it is an adaptation from the Apocalypse (xix. 1. 2. 3): "Alleluia. I heard, as it were, the voice of many multitudes in heaven, saying, Alleluia. Salvation and glory and power is to our God. How true and just are His judgments, Alleluia; and again they said, Alleluia."

The Collect bears no direct reference to the Alleluiatic farewell. It is not, however, the ordinary Septuagesima Collect, nor have we met with it in any other breviary.

#### COLLECTA.

Concede quæsumus Omnipotens Deus, fragilitati nostræ satisfactionem competentem: ut sine reparationis effectu, et pia conversatione recensat et conplexatione suscipiat. Per Dominum.

The Office is thus brought to a close:—

Benedicamus Domino, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.  
Deo gratias, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.

The following is another and more elaborate Alleluiatic service. It is apparently the office to which Archbishop Hilbert alludes in the sermon which we have quoted above, and, in that case, must date from at least the early days of the twelfth century. The version, however, which we are about to lay before our readers was transcribed from some thirteenth century MSS. belonging to the Church of Auxerre, by the learned Abbe Lebouf, canon and succentor of the same church early in the last century, and by him communicated to the Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur, the continuers of Du Cange's Glossary.<sup>1</sup> And it is from this work that we have culled it. The office in question is headed, *Alleluaticum Officium*, and the rubric thus continues: *Sabbatum in Septuagesima ad Vesperas. Antiph. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.* No mention is made of the antiphon being repeated, nor is any direction given as to what psalm should be sung. It would seem then that at Auxerre, as at Bruges, the ferial psalms were used, but in contradistinction to the Bruges rite, that they were all said under one antiphon.

<sup>1</sup> See Du Cange, vol. i., page 312 col. 1733. Osmont, Paris.



The portion of Scripture appointed for the Little Chapter is thus indicated: *Capitulum—Benedictus*—probably 2 Cor. i. 3, 4: *Benedictus Deus et Pater Domini*, &c., is the passage intended to be read. There is no responsory, the hymn following immediately after the Little Chapter. This is no other than the *Alleluia dulce carmen* which we have quoted. The reading, however, is not quite the same as that of the Bruges rite. Thus, in the fourth line of the first strophe, Auxerre has *et* for *est*, and in the third strophe we find:—

Alleluia non meremur  
In perenne psallere.  
Alleluia *vox* reatus  
Cogit intermittere, &c. :

where *in* and *vox* take the place respectively of *nunc* and *nos*.

The last strophe, too, reads differently; here we have

Unde laudanda precamur  
Te Beata Trinitas  
Ut tuum nobis videre  
Pascha *det* in æthere ;

where *laudando*, *Te*, and *det* are substituted respectfully for *laudando*, *O*, and *des*.

The *V.* and *R.* which follow the hymn are the ordinary *V.* and *R.* of the feria.

The Antiphon to the *Magnificat*, full of poetry, and most beautiful in language, evidently inspired by the words with which his father-in-law would fain have detained the ill-fated Levite “ who dwelt on the side of Mount Ephraim.”<sup>1</sup> thus beseeches *Alleluia* to prolong her sojourn one day more:—

Tarry with us this day also, Alleluia, Alleluia ;  
And on the morrow thou shalt depart, Alleluia, Alleluia,  
Alleluia ;  
And when the sun shall have arisen, thou shalt go thy  
way, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.

The Collect which follows is no less beautiful:—

“ O God, who dost permit us to bid Alleluia a solemn farewell, grant, we beseech Thee, that, in eternal blessedness with

<sup>1</sup> See Judges xix.

Thy saints who sing Alleluia without ceasing, we too may be able happily to unite our voices in one never-ending Alleluia. Through Jesus Christ Our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, One God, world without end. Amen.”

Six *Alléluias* make up the invitatory at Matins, the hymn is the same as at Vespers, and but one Antiphon is given for each nocturn, viz., *Alleluia*. At the first, however, it was repeated once only: at the second, twice: and at the third, three times. No special psalms are indicated, and hence it may be inferred that those of the Sunday were said. No mention is made of *VV.* and *RR.*, except at the first nocturn, where we have the following notice:—“ *V. Memor fui nocte,*” &c.; and from this it would seem that the ordinary Sunday *VV.* and *RR.* were used.

The Lessons are thus indicated:—For the first nocturn, *Lectio I—In principio creavit Deus,* &c. For the second, *Sequuntur lectiones à Genesi;* and for the third, *Homilia Evangelii, simile est regnum.* Undoubtedly the responsories are the most striking portion of this office. They are all proper to the festival, and form a series of nine valedictory addresses, in which the mystic word itself is again and again immediately invoked. Thus, for example, “ May thy years be multiplied by the Lord, Alleluia. Mayest thou walk in the path of wisdom, and return to us through the way of justice, Alleluia, Alleluia.” Or, again, “ May the good angel of the Lord attend thee, and order all thy ways, that again with joy thou mayest come back to us, Alleluia, Alleluia.”

Quaint in conception, as they undoubtedly are, and utterly out of harmony with the spirit of the present day, several of them, nevertheless, are not without a certain fantastic beauty, and all bear witness to the Scriptural research of the age in which they were written.

After visiting one of those gilded temples which modern culture has reared to art, where all is calculated to delight the eye and charm the senses, where realism pure and simple in all her naked beauty rules supreme, it is sometimes refreshing to turn into some quiet church which, in

days gone by, the simple piety of our forefathers built to God's glory, and there to contemplate for a few moments their rude conceptions of the ideal.

Poetry and art are twin sisters, and the following responsories breathe out, as it were, the very soul of the middle ages. We give them *in extenso* :—

- I. *R.* Alleluia. Dum praesens est invitantur illam, et desiderant illam dum se eduxerit :  
Et in perpetuum coronata triumphat ante Dominum, Alleluia.
- V. In amicitia illius delectatio bona, quoniam immortalis est in conspectu illius.  
Et in perpetuum, &c.
- II. *R.* Multiplicentur a Domino anni tui, Alleluia ; per viam sapientiae incedas,  
Et per semitam justitiae revertaris ad nos, Alleluia, Alleluia.
- V. Sola namque tenes principatum in conspectu Domini, propterea revertere in thesaurostuos.  
Et per semitam, &c.
- III. *R.* Alleluia Sola tenes principatum in conspectu Domini, propterea revertere in thesauros tuos, te benedicant Angeli,  
Quia placuisti Domino, Alleluia, Alleluia.
- V. Angelus Domini bonus comitetur tecum, et bene disponat itinera tua.  
Quia placuisti Domina, Alleluia, Alleluia.
- IV. *R.* Angelus Domini bonus comitetur tecum, Alleluia, et bene disponat itinera tua  
Ut iterum cum gaudio revertaris ad nos, Alleluia, Alleluia.
- V. Multiplicentur à Domino anni tui per viam sapientiae incedas :  
Ut iterum cum gaudio, &c.
- V. *R.* Alleluia. Revertere in thesauros tuos : te benedicant Angeli, Alleluia.
- V. Sola namque tenes principatum in conspectu Domini, propterea revertere in thesauros tuos.  
Te benedicant Angeli, Alleluia.
- VI. *R.* Alleluia, Delectatio bona in operibus manum illius.  
Divitiae multae, Alleluia, Alleluia.
- V. Speciosa facta es, et suavis in deliciis multis.  
Divitiae multae, Alleluia, Alleluia.

VII. *R.* Nomen bonum melius est quam divitiæ multæ.  
Super aurum et topazium gratia bona est, Alleluia,  
Alleluia.

*V.* Quam dulcia faucibus meis eloquia tua Domine, super  
mel et favum ori meo.<sup>2</sup> Super aurum et topazium  
etc.

VIII. *R.* Alleluia, Judica judicium meum, et redime me,  
Alleluia, a calumniantibus me, Alleluia.

*V.* Vide humilitatem meam, et eripe me, quia legem  
tuam non sum oblitus. Alleluia.

IX. *R.* Alleluia. Mane apud nos hodie, et cras proficisceris  
Alleluia;

Et dum ortus fuerit dies ambulabis vias tuas, Alleluia,  
Alleluia.

*V.* Angelus Domini bonus comitetur tecum, et bene  
disponat itinera tua.<sup>1</sup>

Et dum ortus, &c.

The following excerpt will sufficiently indicate the  
manner of saying Lauds :—

*In Laudibus Ant. Omnes sumus estientes Alleluia, Alleluia.*  
*Psal. Dominus regnavit. Jubilate. Deus. Ant. Benedicat terra*  
*Dominum et omnia nascentia in ea hymnum dicant Allel. All. Cent.*  
*Benedicite. Ant. Alleluia sola tenes principalum in conspectu*  
*Domini, propterea revertere in thesauros tuos, te benedicant*  
*Angeli. Allel. All. Psal. Laudate. Capitulum. Hymnus Antiph.*  
*ad Benedictus ut supra ad i vesperis.*

No special office is noted for second vespers nor the  
other hours, but the manner in which the psalm *Laudate* is  
appointed to be sung is very curious. Du Cange thus  
describes it :—

*Psalmus Laudate in Laudibus hoc cantabantur ritu.*

*Alleluia, Laudate Dominum de coelis ; laudate eum in excelsis,*  
*Alleluia.*

*Laudate eum omnes Angeli ejus : laudate eum omnes virtutes*  
*ejus. Alleluia, Alleluia.*

*Laudate eum sol et luna : laudate eum omnes stellæ et lumen.*  
*Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia. Ubi vides 1º versui addi semel*  
*Alleluia, bis secundo, ter sequenti, et sic de ceteris.*

Whether or no, all three psalms, *Laudate Dominum*,  
*Cantate*, and *Laudate in Sanctis*, are included under the  
heading *Laudate*, would seem to be doubtful ; but if this

<sup>1</sup> Psalm cxviii. 103.



is so, the number of *Alleluias* following the last verse of the last psalm would be no less than twenty-eight, and during the singing of the whole three the sacred cry of exultation would have been repeated four hundred and seven times; but, even supposing that the first psalm only is to be understood, then we have no less than one hundred and six *Alleluias*. In either case, the office of Lauds must have been very appreciably lengthened, more especially as the chant to which the words were sung was most probably pneumatic.

This same rite was observed in the Monastery of St. Germain at Auxerre as early as the ninth century, as Henricus testifies in his work, *De Miraculis S. Germani*. Moreover, in a missal of the same period, also according to the “use” of Auxerre, we find that the first Collect for Septuagesima Sunday is no other than the *Deus qui nos concedis* of the above office, while the second is the ordinary *Preces populi tui* of Roman use. Curiously enough, the Alleluiatric service was at Auxerre afterwards transferred to the Feast of St. Stephen, December 26th, as witness the antiphonaries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. What could have been the signification of the rite on that day, it would be difficult to conjecture; it certainly could hardly have been intended for an Adieu.

It was, doubtless, the desire to lend solemnity to the farewell ceremony, which led to the celebration of Alleluiatric funeral services, and, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, to actual representations of interments.

These took place on Septuagesima Sunday. Thus in St. Udobric, the compiler of the use of Cluny, we read—“ *In Septuagesima adeps simul cum Alleluia sepelitur:* ” and we likewise find mention of such practices in a twelfth century Missal and in a twelfth century antiphonary, both according to the rite of the Cathedral of Auxerre. Indeed, as late as the fifteenth century the Church of Toul still maintained them, as the following rubric from the Cathedral Statutes of that date, Article xv., clearly shows:—

“ On the Saturday preceding Septuagesima Sunday, at the hour of none, let the children of the choir, attired in festal array,

meet together in the great sacristy, and then let them proceed to the interment of Alleluia.

“ And when the last *Benedicamus* shall have been said let them go forth in solemn procession with cross, and candles, and holy water, and incense, bearing in their hands the representation of a corpse (*glebam*) after the manner of a funeral.

“ And let them pass through the choir, and go out into the cloister, even to the place of sepulture, wailing and uttering cries of sorrow as they go.

“ And when the corpse shall have been incensed by one or other of them, and sprinkled with holy water, let them return again by the way by which they went forth.”<sup>1</sup>

The coming back of Alleluia after the penitential seasons of Lent and Passiontide were over, was likewise at one time made the occasion of special services of rejoicing ; although, at least in Amalaire's day, the welcome was a less solemn function than the farewell. Thus the French Breviaries celebrate it—we are again quoting from Neale<sup>2</sup>—on the second Sunday after Easter. After the beautiful lesson from St. Augustine, in his exposition of the 110th Psalm :—“ The days have come for us to sing Alleluia. Now, these days come only to pass away, and pass away to come again, and typify the Day which does not come and pass away, to which, when we shall have come, clinging to it, we shall not pass away.” They give for the responses :—

*V.* Through the streets of Jerusalem, Alleluia shall be sung.  
Blessed be the Lord who hath exalted her. Let His kingdom be for ever and ever : Alleluia, Alleluia.

*R.* Alleluia : Salvation, and glory, and power to our God, for true and just are His judgments.

Let His kingdom, &c.

Strange, incomprehensible, almost frivolous, as must appear to minds trained from earliest childhood in nineteenth century modes of thought, the spirit which inspired such fantastic rites as those we have just been considering,

<sup>1</sup> *Sabbato Septuagesima in Nova Conveniant pueri chori feriant in magno vestiario, et ibi ordinent sepulturam, Alleluia.*

*Et expedito cantu Benedicamus, procedant cum crucibus, tortibus, aqua benedicta et incenso, portantibusque glebam ad modum funeris, incensent per choram et vadant ad lastrum ululantes usque ad locum ubi sepelitur : ibique aspersa aqua et dato incenso ab eorum altero redeant eodem itinere.*

See Neale's *Medieval Hymns*, third edition, page 183.

to them, at least, we owe, if nothing else, one of the most beautiful poems which ever graced the Church's liturgy. We allude to the sequence which, in the tenth century, Gottschalk wrote for “*the deposition of Alleluia*.” Here, in one marvellous category of animate and inanimate beings, in which, strangely enough, man, possibly in homage to the God-man, Christ Jesus, takes precedence even of the angels and the souls of the just made perfect, he summons all creation to unite together in jubilating to the glory of the Eternal King (to quote the poet's own words) that song which Christ Himself approves, even Alleluia.

Translated into English by the late Dr. Neale, and incorporated into various collections of hymns, the Alleluiatic sequence, as it has sometimes been called, seems thus to have obtained great popularity; but the beautiful original, to which the English version, beautiful as it undoubtedly is, cannot for one moment be compared, is, we believe, still almost unknown. It does not seem unfitting, then, that we too should make Gottschalk's canticle our own farewell to Alleluia:—

1. Cantemus cuncti melodum nunc Alleluia.
2. In laudibus aeterni regis haec plebs resultet Alleluia.
3. Hoc denique coelestes chori cantent in altum Alleluia.
4. Hoc beatorum per prata paradisiaca psallat concentus Alleluia.
5. Quin et astrorum micantia luminaria jubleant altum Alleluia.
6. Nubium cursus, ventorum volatus, fulgorum coruscatio et tonitruum sonitus dulce consonent simul Alleluia.
7. Fluctus et undae, imber et procellae, tempestas et serenitas, cauma, gelu, nix pruinae, saltus nemora, pangant Alleluia.
8. Hinc variae volucres Creatorum laudibus concinite cum Alleluia.
9. Ast illinc respondeant voces altae diversarum bestiarum Alleluia.
10. Istinc montium celsi vertices sonent Alleluia.  
Illinc vallium profunditates psallant Alleluia.
11. Tu quoque, maris jubilans abyse, dic Alleluia.  
Nec non terrarum molis immensitates; Alleluia.
12. Nunc omne genus humanum laudans etxulet; Alleluia.  
Et Creatori grates frequetans consonet; Alleluia.
13. Hoc denique nomen audire jugiter delectatur; Alleluia.  
Hoc etiam carmen caeleste comprobatur ipse Christus Alleluia.

14. Nunc vos socii cantate laetantes ; Alleluia.  
Et vos pueruli respondete semper Alleluia.
15. Nunc omnes canite simul Alleluia Domino,  
Alleluia Christo Pneumatique Alleluia.
16. Laus Trinitati aeternae.  
Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.

## GLENDALOUGH IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

IN most of the reference libraries of Ireland there is to be found a book in long folio and of less than a hundred pages, which, for historic matter, is one of the most interesting productions, whether for the historian, or for the archaeologist, or for the ecclesiastical writer. It bears the rather quaint title—*Cartae, Privilegiata et Immunitates*. The book is simply a collection, in printed form, of some of the many regal documents that came into force soon after the invasion of Ireland by the Normans. This invasion happened in the sixth or seventh decade of the twelfth century under Henry II., King of England, and at the instance of Diarmuid MacMurrough, the last King of Leinster.

Almost the first of this collection of documents is one, a charter, that speaks entirely and only of the ancient abbey of Glendalough and of its equally ancient diocese. This charter is generally known as the *Concessio*, or grant of Glendalough Abbey to its Abbot Thomas, by Strongbow, the then Vicegerent of Henry II. It is, therefore, not only an interesting document in itself, but a very instructive one as well. And whether we merely peruse it in the most cursory way, or study it carefully and deeply, our efforts will gain us a clearer insight into many obscure things in connection with this momentous period of Glendalough's history. We can examine this charter either as to the spirit that pervades it, or as to the subject-matter of which it treats. If we reflect on its spirit, we shall be afforded a fine opportunity of understanding something about that dread and destructive power of the olden days, called Feudalism. But as this is not our present purpose, we will content



ourselves with an inquiry into the special object of the charter, viz., the bestowal on the abbot, by royal gift, of all the belongings of Glendalough, just as these belongings existed in the twelfth century, and perhaps for many ages before it. This inquiry will be the more easy, because, in the body of the charter itself, there is recorded a detailed list of the churches and towns, and, it may be, of the then very parishes and deaneries of this ancient diocese. And yet this inquiry will be a most difficult one, all the same; for most of the names recorded are exceedingly hard to explain and to make recognisable, as many of the boundaries of the ancient districts of this ancient diocese, after seven centuries of unceasing change, are now almost past recognition. Notwithstanding, the attempt will now be made to trace by means of these old names the full extent of the olden diocese of Glendalough.

In introducing the charter, it will be enough to say that it shall be divided into three parts. In the first part will be given the opening paragraph, or beginning of the charter, with a few notes on it; in the second part, the body of the charter, or the list of names of places, with a grouping of these places into districts, and such notes as may help to their recognition; and in the third part, the conclusion of the charter, with such remarks as may be necessary.

PART I.—STRONGBOW'S "CONCESSIO" (OPENING PARAGRAPH),  
A.D. 1173.

"Let present and future generations know that I, Earl Richard, Vicegerent of the King of England in Ireland, acting in all things, have given and granted, and, by this my present charter, have confirmed to Thomas (my favourite and special cleric) the Abbey and personatus of Glendalough completely (integre) with all their appurtenances and lands and dignities within the city itself; and in all the churches and towns of the same outside the city, in perpetual alms."

A clear and obvious distinction is drawn in the above between what is within the city and what is without or outside the city. History and tradition both testify that the city of Glendalough was very populous and very extensive. Founded as it was in the sixth century by the famous St. Kevin, there is no doubt that at one period of Glendalough's

greatness its citizens numbered more than three thousand. And when we remember that this city comprised, not merely the territory of the Glen-of-the-two-lakes (extending for three miles and more), but also the territory of Lough Nahangan (or Glendassaun, extending for another three miles towards Wicklow Gap); and when we remember as well, that, besides the separate cells of the monks and the separate sites of the Seven Churches, there existed within the area of the city, halls for study, buildings for libraries, houses for composing and copying manuscripts; and mills, and workshops, and factories; and farms, and fields, and woods—the latter surrounding the city as a fringe—it will be very easy to realize that “the appurtenances, and lands, and dignities within the city itself” were of great consideration and importance, and were well worthy of royal gift as a personal demesne, and an immediate jurisdiction to its Abbot Thomas. In other words, these were what constituted the abbey itself in the purview of the charter. And besides this abbey, it is equally clear that Strongbow meant to bestow another, or an outer demesne, or an outside jurisdiction, so to say: viz., “the appurtenances, and lands, and dignities in all the churches and towns outside the city.” And all these churches and towns, it is to be observed, formed the full extent of the old diocese of Glendalough in the twelfth century. The list of them, as detailed in the charter, shall now be given, with their respective groupings.

PART II.—BODY OF CHARTER GIVING DETAILS OF GLENDALOUGH DIOCESES.

“These are the lands which belong of ancient right (*jure antiquo*) to the forementioned abbey, scilicet:—

1. FFertir; and 2. Maghmersa; and 3. Umail; with all other appurtenances around the city itself *circa ipsam civitatem*.
4. Et in terra ex altera parte montium, . . . (17 churches).
5. Et in terra de Ui Muirethaighe, . . . (10 churches).
6. Et in terra de Ui Faelan, . . . (6 churches).
7. Et in terra de Umeilgille, . . . (6 churches).
8. Et in terra de Magillamocholmog, . . . (9 churches).
9. Et in terra de Wyglo, . . . (11 churches).
10. Et in terra de Arelo, . . . (10 churches).
11. Et in terra de Ducemcelaigh . . . (1 church).
12. Et in terra de Indalbaigh, . . . (1 church).”

Two observations may here be made. The charter distinctly specifies that the first three terrae or districts are in the immediate neighbourhood of the abbey, "circa ipsam civitatem," and therefore that the other districts are situated outside both the abbey itself and these three first-mentioned districts. Our itinerary through them, no matter in what direction made, will prove the truth of these observations, and show conclusively that all the districts formed but one territory of the old diocese in question.

No. 1. *Et in terra de FFertir.*

This district is the most easy to recognise and locate. It extended from near the southern foot of the larger Sugar Loaf Mountain to the site of the present-day village of Roundwood, for the length of about five miles. And on each side of this length this district was flanked by two ranges of fairly-sized hills, whose sky lines were five or six miles from each other. The fall of the water from both these high grounds formed the one river of the FFertir. And since the beginning of the present century this river has been modernized into the now famous name of the Vartry water. It still leaves the old territory of the FFertir at the south-eastern corner, at that point where occurs the celebrated and well-known waterfall of the Devil's Glen. Though the charter makes no mention of any churches in this district, there is no doubt of there having been three, at least, within its extent; viz., one at Glassnamullaun, on the north-west; the second at Ballinafinchogue (Ashtown), on the south-west; and the third at Knock-a-teampul, on the south-east.

No. 2. *Et in terra de Maghmersa.*

The title of this district (Maghmersa) has been always an inexplicable enigma, giving occasion to the most perplexing and misleading of guesses. The word itself is a manifest corruption or curtailment of what was meant to be a double or two-named appellation. That this appellation was really of this character, is clear from the fact that this district was

a double or two-halved one from the olden days, and is so still to this present day. The Bull of Innocent III., issued in A.D. 1199, makes a better attempt at expressing the correct and full form of this twofold name. This document is a confirmation by the Pope mentioned to the diocese of Glendalough of its old time territories and privileges; and, like Strongbow's charter in detailing the names of places, it mentions the name of the district in question as MacMohetsam. Even this expression, though a closer offer, is a corruption and curtailment as well as Maghniersa. The two names meant to be expressed by the respective terms in both documents are: Keowgh and Saugheen. The name Keowgh is itself a contraction, or rather is the people's way of saying the old Irish form MacEochadha or Baille MacEochadha. And this was the name that was sought to be expressed by the first six letters of the words of the Papal Bull, and by the first five of that of Strongbow's charter, viz., Macmoh and Maghm. The next two letters of both words, "et" and "er," were simply the conjunction *and*. Whereas the last three letters "sam," in the one, and "sa" in the other, were an attempt at expressing the second name, Saugheen. And this name Saugheen is simply the pronunciation still prevailing from time immemorial in the district, *e.g.*, of St. Kevin's name, Sauncingín, which the Normans themselves strove to express by the phrase *Sanf Kevin*. And the term or phrase means the land, or the portion, or the district, bestowed upon or belonging to St. Kevin himself. It is most likely that this explanation of Saugheen will call up to the mind of the reader the anachronism or burlesque incident, in which St. Kevin and the gander and the king are made to act a certain part, something after the manner of St. Brigid and her mantle and another king, in connection with the Curragh of Kildare.

The clearest proof that the above explanation is the likeliest and the truest one of our difficulty, is that these two half districts of Keowgh and Saugheen have to this very day retained their respective names, and are as distinct and as distinguishable now as they were in the twelfth century, and by precisely the same criteria, viz., their



watersheds. The watershed of Keowgh or Baille Maceochada sends down the waters from the hillsides and hollows surrounding its town through Glenmicanass, and over that glen's waterfall on to and by Lara. And it should be noticed here that in this very name of Glenmicanass we have a reminder that even the waterfall of this glen is only the waterfall of Keowgh's glen. In the old Irish the appellation was thus: "Glenna MicEochada an ass;" or, in plain English, the waterfall of the glen of the Keowghs; or, as they say to-day, Glenmicanass. On the other hand, the watershed of Saugheen, starting in the Glen of Lough Tay (Luggielaw), and passing into and through the Glen of Lough Dan, and flowing onwards till it passes Annamoe and Castle Kevin on its right and left banks respectively, it meets the watershed of Keowgh at Lara, where both enter the river Avonmore, which is itself here only the watershed of the Glen-of-the-two-Lakes and of Lough Nahanagan or Glendassaun. It is also to be remarked that this double district of Maghmersa or Macmohetsam is situated exactly between the Abbey of Glendalough and the district of FFertir.

In the half district of Saugheen there are still traceable the sites of four churches which were in use in the twelfth century. The first was on the northern shore of Lough Tay opposite Luggielaw House; the second, at Ballinteggart over Lough Dan; the third, on the northern brow of Ballinacor Hill, where now is the Protestant church; and the fourth, at Killifin, opposite Castle Kevin and Trooperstown Hills. Lastly, the better to help the reader to recognise the location of these districts No. 1 and No. 2, it should be borne in mind that these two districts, together with the old city of Glendalough at this present day, form the one parish of Glendalough, Annamoe, and Roundwood, save and except that one half of FFertir, the half on the eastern bank of the Vartry water, is attached to the parishes of Kilquade and Ashford, owing to changes in some age subsequent to the twelfth century.

No. 3. *Et in terra de Umail.*

It is very remarkable that the charter expressly speaks of Umail as being a district in the near neighbourhood of the Abbey of Glendalough—just as near to it as were the districts of FFertir and Maghmersa, *i.e.*, "circa civitatem ipsam," or around the city itself. Now it is well known that the glen of Imail lies to the west and south of Glendalough, at a distance of many miles, and that between the two glens there stand some of the highest mountains within the Wicklow highlands. Does it not seem likely that the charter implies by its words that in those early days, and before them, communication and intercourse were carried on between the citizens of Glendalough and the people of Imail by some road or route over the high grounds and deep hollows of the intervening mountains? It is more than certain that such a highway was quite feasible. For to this day its recognised traces are to be found along the brink of Polanass Waterfall—a mountain river that feeds the upper of the two Lakes of Glendalough. And these traces can be followed out to the high levels of Lugduff, overlooking the lake, and further away beyond Lugduff till they reach Table Mountain, near whose top runs the old road coming up from Glennalure; and winding its way down the beetling side of the same Table Mountain through Knocknamunua, this same road leads into the depths of the Glen of Imail below. The tradition amongst the people to this day is undeniable, that there did exist, in ages past, such an intercourse over the route just described. Our ancestors of those early days had no roads, or system of roads, such as we have. They had to take the ground, as it lay before them, in their journeys from place to place.

Our charter, then, must have been right in supposing and implying that the district of Umail (though so far away) was as near to the Abbey of Glendalough as were FFertir and Maghmersa. These are the lands which belong of ancient right to the forementioned Abbey, *scil.* FFertir, Maghmersa, and Umail, with all their appurtenances

around the city itself." It is not necessary to fix the locality of this district—everybody knows or has heard of the Glen of Imaal. It is surrounded on its four sides by high hills—the waters from which collect into two large channels, and, uniting just before they leave the glen, form the uppermost reaches of the famed river Slaney.

No. 4. *Et in terra ex altera parte Montium.*

The charter does not mention the exact title of this district. It uses only the general description—"ex altera parte montium," on the other side of the mountains. The charter undoubtedly meant a distinct district by these words—and one located right beside the district of Umail. History testifies that these two districts were beside each other, and formed, it might be said, one and the same territory, belonging to one and the same people, just as we have seen in the case of the double district of Keowgh and Saugheen, under the name of Maghmersa or Macmohetsan. This phrase then, "ex altera parte Montium," may mean that the people of Glendalough may have communicated with this district by the route just spoken of in connection with Umail; and, therefore, considered this district to be part and parcel of Umail, and located on the other side of the hills standing on its eastern bounds, and between the two districts. Or, the phrase, "ex altera parte Montium," may again mean that this untitled district, though situated beside Umail, and part and parcel of it, was, however, accessible by another route, over other mountains surrounding Glendalough itself; and that, therefore, this district was indeed on the other side of these mountains. In sustaiment of this view, there is the well-known fact of St. Kevin's cassau or causeway from Glendalough through Lough Nahanagan and Wicklow Gap. This road passed through Hollywood, over the intervening hills, and led into the very heart of this district, "ex altera parte Montium."

The charter makes mention of the churches and towns in this district as the following :—

Dunbusci,	.	.	.	(Dubboyke).
Elpi,	.	.	.	(Crehelp).
Arainiebroin,	.	.	.	
Balaloman,	.	.	.	(Lemonstown).
Cellbelet,	.	.	.	(Kilbellyd).
Achadbudi,	.	.	.	
Donarde,	.	.	.	(Donard).
Belimeneig,	.	.	.	(Ballymoney).
Cell Chuachi,	.	.	.	(Kilcock).
Rathsallache,	.	.	.	(Rathsallagh).
Dunmeilloben,	.	.	.	(Dunlavin).
Ballinmeil.	.	.	.	
Balliunendig.	.	.	.	
Topor,	.	.	.	(Tubber).
Ballingenbran,	.	.	.	(Rathbran).
Cellfrene,	.	.	.	(Frenestown).
Cellinulagair,	.	.	.	(near Colbinstown).

If further proof were necessary to show that Umail and this district, No. 4, were beside one another, and formed one and the same territory, we have it in the Bull of Alexander III., issued in 1179, six years after Strongbow's charter. In this bull there is no mention made of the churches and towns as detailed by the charter, but the two districts are joined together, and spoken of by the Pope under the one comprehensive title of *Domnachmore Umail*. Lastly, to come to the experience of our own day, we find these two districts of Umail and "*ex altera parte Montium*" still to the good, and forming, for ages past, the present well-known and extensive parish of Dunlavin and Donard.

#### No. 5. *Et in terra de Ui Muirethaighe.*

This means the ancient district of O'Murthy or O'Murray. It extended from the northern boundary of the present parish of Narraghmore (An Forrac Mor) to the southern boundary of the present parish of Castledermott, and included as well the parishes of Moone and Athy. This district, therefore, in the olden days formed the southern half of the



present county of Kildare. It was situated immediately next to the last-named district, No. 4; because the last-named town or church in No. 4 district, viz., Cellin Ulugair, was only a few miles distant from the bounds of the O'Murray district. Our charter, in speaking of this district of Ui Muirethaighe, calls attention to two very notable facts. First, it plainly tells us that Ui Muirethaighe belonged in the twelfth century and before it—one half to Umail, and the other half to Ui Laoigheis or O'Leix; and, secondly, that each portion of the Ui Muirethaighe thus distinguished had its own separate and distinct churches. The wording of the charter hereupon is as follows: "Et in terra de Ui Muirethaighe; dimidiam partem de Umail;" and then follow the names of six churches as being in this portion: "Et in terra de Ui Muirethaighe; dimidiam partem de Loche Leighe; and next come the names of four churches as being in this portion. In the words Loche Leighe we are reminded of a very ancient territorial appellation, coming down from the second century.

It is recorded in the history of that early age that Eochaidh Finn Fothart and his foster-son, Lewy Laisheach, at the instance of the then King of Leinster, drove back and expelled out of the kingdom of Leinster the Munster men who had recently overrun and captured both Ossory and the whole of Laoigheis (Leix) as far as the top of the Hill of Maestan, or Mullaghmast. From this it can be seen that the ancient territory of Leix extended beyond the eastern or left bank of the river Barrow, away to the west bank of the river Grees, on the edge of which stood the above-named Hill of Mullaghmast. This territory, too, from the Barrow to the Grees, retained its name in after ages in the modified form of Leath Leighies; or, as the charter expresses it, Loche Leigh. In later day law documents this same territory is mentioned as that of Leigh and Kilmeede. It may be concluded, then, that the river Grees, which flows through the whole length of Ui Muirethaighe, was the division line, north and south, between the two portions specified by the charter; and that the Imail portion (dimidia pars Umail) was situate between the Colon Hills on the east, and the Grees river on

the west ; and that the Loche Leighe portion (*dimidia pars de Loche Leighe*) covered the ground between the Grees river on the east, and the river Barrow on the west. It is furthermore clear that both these portions, though so distinctly named, and seemingly separated, were subject to the sway and dominion of the Abbot of Glendalough, and belonged to that ancient diocese as the one territory or district of *Ui Muirethaighe*. The churches of each portion were :—

1. *Ui Muirethaighe, dimidiam partem de Umail.*

Lessnahmusen	.	.	(Ballaghmoon).
Cell na manac	.	.	(Dunmanogue).
Balitorsna	.	.	(Castledermott).
Donmachmore	.	.	(Kinneigh, <i>i. e.</i> , ceann eaglais).
Hicotlud	.	.	(Ballacoolane).
Munisuli	.	.	(Moone and Timolin).

2. *Ui Muirethaighe, dimidiam partem de Loche Leigh.*

Ardmeic	.	.	(Ardree and Athy).
Cluandarcado	.	.	(Tankardstown).
Rebane	.	.	(Reban or Kilberry)
Raffan	.	.	(Narraghtmore or Crookstown and Kilmeade).

No. 6. *Et in terra de Ui Faelan.*

This olden territory extended from portion of the northern bounds of *Ui Muirethaighe* away north to the bounds of the kingdom of Meath, and formed the north-eastern part of the present county Kildare. The territory alongside this *Ui Faelan* on the westward was that of the ancient and of the equally famous chiefs of *Ui Failghe* (Offaly), and now forming the west of the present Kildare county and a large tract of King's County. We must be careful to guard against the error of imagining that our charter represents the whole of this old district of *Ui Faelan* to have belonged to Glendalough diocese. The plain fact is, that it makes no such representation in express words. And we can fairly conclude, from the number of churches it specifies as belonging to Glendalough, that it means to make no such representation. The number of these churches

amount to six altogether, the ancient originals of the present-day parishes of Kilcullen, Killoshee, Eddestown, Killeel, Maynooth, and Celbridge.

If it be asked, to what diocese belonged the remaining portions, or most northerly part of Ui Faelan, the answer is—to the diocese of the famous Abbey of St. Brigid; which Abbey was founded within the territory of the Ui Failghe, or, as we now-a-days call it, the Abbey of Kildare. The old sept of the O'Byrnes was the people paramount in Ui Faelan. And our charter tells us that only a portion of that sept belonged to the diocese of St. Kevin, the other portion of the sept being diocesans of St. Brigid. Whereas the septs of the O'Tooles, who were the people paramount of our districts Nos. 3, 4, and 5, were the devoted and exclusive subjects of St. Kevin's diocese of Glendalough.

This fact may help to throw some light upon what seems to be a great difficulty in the life of St. Laurence, the second Archbishop of the diocese of Dublin. By blood he was an O'Toole and an O'Byrne. By birth he belonged to the district of Ui Muirethaighe (having been born in Castledermott). But we are told in his life, that he was baptized miles away from Castledermott, viz., in the Abbey of St. Brigid of Ui Failghe (and now, as was remarked before, called the Abbey of Kildare). The reason of this proceeding most likely was—the mother of the saint was an O'Byrne, and therefore one of the sept of Ui Faelan. And there is a tradition to this day in Kildare County, to the effect that the saint's father gave his consent to the mother to send the infant to her own father's home. And her father, being a diocesan of St. Brigid's, had his grandchild christened in the Abbey of St. Brigid. We shall now give the churches named in the charter. They are the following:—

Ballicutlane	.	.	.	(Kilcullen).
Dundaemaene	.	.	.	(Killoshee).
Rathedagain	.	.	.	(Eddestown).
Cell Chenulli	.	.	.	(Killeel and Kill).
Lathrach na Bruin	.	.	.	(Maynooth).
Techmoche in Arusna	.	.	.	(Taptoe and Celbridge).

It is necessary to remark here that the Bull of Pope Alexander III., A.D. 1179, speaks of the "Ecclesia de Cell Usalli," *i.e.*, the church of St. Auxilius, or, as it is now called, Killooshee. But it says nothing of the churches of the charter above named as Dundaumene and Rathedeggain. This leaves it to be inferred that both are included under Killooshee in the Papal document. Moreover, in mentioning Techtua (*i.e.*, Techmocha), the Bull immediately after speaks of Teach Cummin, *i.e.*, Staccumney, which was the twelfth century title of Celbridge parish. The Bull also specifies Leth Confi, which, of course, means the parish or district of Leixlip. With these additional names, Alexander's Bull only confirms Strongbow's *Concessio* as to the number of churches in Uí Faolan belonging to Glendalough diocese.

Cell Culind . . . .	(Kilcullen).
Cell Usuailli . . . .	(Killooshee and Eadestown).
Cell Chelli . . . .	(Kilteel and Kill).
Teach Cummin . . . .	(Staccumney or Celbridge).
Teach Tua . . . .	(Taptoe).
Larach na Bruin . . . .	(Maynooth).
Leth Confi . . . .	(Leixlip).

It may be also remarked that Cell Usuailli or Killooshee was a foundation made by St. Patrick himself in the fifth century, St. Auxilius having been consecrated bishop by St. Patrick, and placed by him over the old territory then called Magh Liffei. Apparently, too, there was another Patrician foundation, on the Maynooth side, in the ruins of the old church of Donnachinnore, which are to be seen to-day midway between Leixlip and Maynooth. Killooshee seems to have maintained an existence till about the middle of the eleventh century. The Annals of Ireland record the deaths of its abbots up to that time. But in A.D. 1035 the Danes plundered and destroyed it, and, most likely, with it the other Patrician church of Donnachinnore. After these destructions, perhaps, it was that the sept of the O'Byrnes, belonging till then to these churches, transferred themselves and their territory to the spiritual care of St. Kevin's successors in the Abbey of



Glendalough—rather than to the guidance of St. Brigid's bishops of Kildare; and hence it comes that we find this portion of Ui Faelan given in Strongbow's charter as part of the old diocese of Glendalough.

*No. 7. Et in terra de Umeilgille (i.e., Ui Caellach Cualan)*

If we reverse our itinerary, and retrace our steps from Leixlip to Kildare or to Eadestown, or even to Killooshee, we can at once cross over the borders into our next or present district. Our charter names it as Umeilgille; but this is a corruption or a contraction for Ui Ceallach Cualan. It is a district that is easily defined, easily described, and easily located. It is bounded on all sides by hills: on the north, by the hills standing between Brittas and Ballinascorney; on the south, by those hills which are themselves the southern boundaries of Hollywood and Ballymore parish; on the west, by the Red hills of Kildare; and on the east, by the hills extending from Kippure Mountain, away down to the mountains overlooking the Seven Churches. The watershed of this expansion of glens and hollows gathers first into two immense headwaters called the Liffey and the King's river, which, uniting into one under Blessington, and flowing for a few miles further, tumble over the world-famed falls of Phoulaphouca, and passes away out of the district a short distance below Ballymore-Eustace.

It should have been remarked that the name of the district, Ui Ceallach Cualan, still lingers within the locality by the faintest of traces. There is no doubt that the district once upon a time had its Baille na g-ceallach Cualan; for these can be traced in the present-day attenuated appellations of Crosscool Harbour and Cullen Hill. Cnoc na g-ceallach Cualan looks to be very suspiciously embalmed in the modern name Golden Hill. Whereas Knock na tillane of to-day is undoubtedly a corrupted and almost worn-out relic of the Cnoc of the Gleana g-ceallach Cualan. The glen itself lies between Kilbride and Liffey Head. The churches of this district, as given in the charter are not so very easily recognised. At the present day there are but three parishes within the old

territory of *Ui Ceallach Cualan*, and the charter gives the number of churches as six, viz. :

Ballindelahinsa	.	.	(Ballymore-Eustace).
Balcumelan <sup>y</sup>	.	.	(Kilmalumney).
Ballinlacuan	.	.	(Luglass and Hollywood).
Ballindeling	.	.	(Tipperkevin).
Cell Boodan	.	.	(Teampul Boodan and Boystown).
Cell Ugarrcon	.	.	(Kilbride and Blessington).

It is to be remarked that the Bull of Alexander III. (1179) makes no mention whatever of the first four churches of the above list, but in their place gives the one denomination of *Domnachmore*—*inachechdha*; and it appears that this latter word, *inachechdha*, is simply the rendering, in the Irish character, of the after oft-used word *Iago*. So the above denomination would mean *Domnachmore Iago*. Moreover, the Bull makes no mention either of the last two churches, but gives in their place the bigger appellation of *Domnach Imeleche*, or *Domnach Emly*, *i.e.*, the church of the bogs; implying, no doubt, that the two Kells, viz., *Cell Boodan* and *Cell Ugarrcon* formed, after the twelfth century, but one ecclesia or parish, *i.e.*, *Domnach Imseleche*.

No. 8. *Et in terra de Magillamocholmog i.e. Feracualan*.

This may be described as the district of what is commonly known as "the Dublin Mountains," along with those other mountains and vales immediately beyond them to the south as far as the Hills of Newcastle looking seaward, and including the two Sugar Leaves. This extent would begin at *Boherna-brinagh* and *Glenismole*, and, stretching by the mountain foot to *Shankil*, would then go south, taking in *Shanganagh*, *Old Connaught*, *Killegar*, and *Glencree*, *Bray Head*, and *Delgany*, as well as the highlands and the lowlands of *Newcastle*. All these mountains and valleys were the ancient territory of *Feracualan*, and constituted the ancient domains of the *Magillamocholmogs*. These *Magillamocholmogs*, like their kinsfolk the *Ui Ceallacs* of *Ui Ceallach Cualan*, were descendants and branches of the more ancient *Ui Donchadha*, and were therefore, kith and kin with the *O'Tools* of *Umail* and of *O'Murrary*, and with the *O'Byrnes*

of Ui Faelan. And it should then be no wonder, because of this kinship, to find them spoken of as being fervent followers of St. Kevin, and their lands and their peoples belonging to the diocese of Glendalough.

The churches mentioned by the charter as existing in Feracualan are the following :—

Techdologa . . .	(Templeogue and Rathfarnham).
Ballivodram . . .	(Sandyford and Glencullen).
Cell escoib silleam . .	(Tullystown and Kill).
Glenmunrei . . .	(Shankill and Old Connaught).
Cell adgair . . .	(Killegar and Enniskerry).
Cell mo mothenoe . .	(Kilmacanogue and Kileroney).
Villa Udenetha . . .	(Bray, Old Rathdown, and Temple Carrick).
Deirgni . . .	(Delgany and Kilguade or Kilcool).
Cell maccubiruin . .	(Hills and Lowlands of Newcastle).

JAMES MANNING, P.P.

## Liturgical Questions.

### THE FIRST PRAYER IN THE "MISSA QUOTIDIANA."

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Father O'Loan has come to be regarded as a reliable authority in the solution of rubrical questions; and, in my opinion, justly so. I fear, however, that the answer given by him in this month's I. E. RECORD to the questions of 'Laonensis,' is calculated to lead some priests into a practice not in harmony with some decrees of S. C. of Rites; which, notwithstanding Fr. O'Loan's extensive reading, must have escaped his notice. When he reads the Responses of S. C. R., which I enclose, and ask you to publish in next month's I. E. RECORD, I feel assured he will freely admit that De Herdt had reason to change his opinion, and willingly join him, A Carpo, and other modern rubricists, in teaching that the first and last prayers in *Missis quotidianis (lectis) defunctorum* are unchangeable.

"I am, Very Rev. dear Sir,

"SACERDOS DUNENSIS ET CONNORENSIS."

I. Presbyter Aquen. S.R.C., humillime supplicavit quatenus sequentia dubia declarare dignaretur :—

Dubium IV. —In missis quotidianis defunctorum possuntne dici plures quam tres orationes? Et oratio secunda potestne mutari scil. dici verb. gr. pro patre, prae notata: “*Deus Veniae largitor?*” E. die 2 Sep. 1741 S.R.C. respondendum censuit. In missis quotidianis, quae pro defunctis celebrantur possunt quidem plures dici orationes quam tres, sed curandum ut sint numero impares! et aliquando pro illa: “*Deus Veniae largitor?*” impune subrogabitur alia verb. gr. pro patre, pro matre, &c., dummodo ultimo loco dicatur illa: “*fidelium,*” &c.

II. Episcopus Veronen S.R.C., nonnulla dubia solvenda proposuit :—

Dubium VII. —Utrum in missis quotidianis defunctorum pro oratione assignata *primo loco*, alia subrogari valeat, puta pro matre, offerente eleemosynam &c.? S. eadem C. die 27 Aug. 1836, rescribendum censuit et servari mandavit; scil: “Quoad primam orationem servetur ordo Missalis; quoad secundam; Detur decretum Aquen. die 2 Sep. 1741 ad dubium iv. (ut supra).”

III. Briocen Caeremoniarum Magister S.R.C., rogavit ut sequentia dubia declarare dignaretur :—

Dubium X. —Utrum in missis quotidianis, sive cum cantu sive lectis teneatur sacerdos recitare 1<sup>o</sup> loco orationem pro defunctis episcopis seu sacerdotibus ut fert missale Romanum? Potestne primo loco recitare orationem: “*Inclina Domine,*” pro defuncto, vel orationem: “*Quaeramus Domine,*” pro defuncta, ejus ad intentionem eleemosyna data est: Secundo loco pro defunctis episcopis &c., tertio loco “*fidelium?*” Et supposito quod negative.

Dubium XI. —Utrum secunda oratio semper mutari possit, et eius loco dici oratio pro defuncto aut defuncta? Ratio dubitandi est, quia Decretum Aquen. fert aliquando pro illa “*Deus Veniae largitor*” impune subrogabitur alia verb. gr. pro patre et matre?

S. R. C. die 12 Aug. 1851 rescripsit et proposita dubia declaravit ut sequetur :—

Ad X. —“In Missis quotidianis standum Missali; et juxta decreta aliquando loco secundae orationis ibi adnotatae substitui posse orationem pro patre et matre.”

Ad XI. “Unicam orationem dicendam in missa de Requie cum cantu pro anima illius, quam designat eleemosynam exhibens.”

IV.—Sacerdos Tuscan. S.R.C. pro opportuna solutione sequens proposuit dubium. Scil. An in missis quotidianis de Requie Sacerdos, sive ratione eleemosynae, sive legati, *private*



celebrans pro aliqua aut pro aliquibus determinatis personis defunctis debetne indiscriminatin dicere primam orationem “Deus qui inter Apostolicos,” &c., primo loco in Missali assignatam; an potius loco dictae primae orationis tenetur aliam dicere ex diversis in eodem missali positis, quae conveniat ei, aut iis determinatis personis, pro quibus missam applicet.

S. eadem C. die 16 Sep. 1865 rescripsit: “Affirmative ad primam partem.” “Negative ad secundam.”

---

“‘Laonensis,’ under the above heading, has proposed a question touching the prayers to be said in the *Missæ Quotidianæ*: should the first prayer be for *uno defuncto* or *una defuncta*, and the second be *Deus veniæ*, &c.? The answer to this question in the last number of the I. E. RECORD states that the three prayers in the Missal satisfy the obligation, but that ‘it is nevertheless advisable that the first prayer should always be that which best suits the intention for which Mass is offered.’ Now this answer appears to contradict authentic decrees of the sacred Council.

“Dubium: Potestne in primo recitare Orationem *Inclina Domine* pro defuncto, vel Orationem *Quæsumus, Domine*, pro defuncta, cujus ad intentionem eleemosyna data est?

“‘In Missis quotidianis standum Missali, et juxta decreta aliquando loco secundæ Orationis ibi adnotatæ substitui posse Orationem pro patre et matre, n. 5208, ad 10, die 12 Aug. 1854.’

“Again, ad Dubium: Utrum in Missis quotidianis defunctorum pro Oratione assignata primo loco alia subrogari valeat, puta, pro matre, offerente eleemosynam?

“‘Quoad primam Orationem servetur ordo Missalis, quoad secundam detur decretum Aquen. diei 2 Sept. 1741 ad dubium IV. Atque ita rescripsit ac servari mandavit, n. 4782, ad 7, die 27 Aug. 1836.’

“Hence any substitution for the first prayer, *Deus qui inter apostolicos . . . pontificali seu<sup>1</sup> sacerdotali*, or the third *Fidelium*, &c., so far from being advisable, is positively forbidden; while only the prayer *pro patre et matre* can be substituted for the second prayer, *Deus veniæ*, &c.

“SYLVESTER MALONE.”

I am so unaccustomed to receive compliments from my critics, that I feel all the more flattered by the high, though un-

<sup>1</sup>There is a decree, S.R.C., which directs the reading always of *Pontificali* with *seu sacerdotali*, though some Missals imply the opposite by giving in brackets the words *seu sacerdotali*.

merited, one paid me by "Sacerdos Dunensis et Connorensis." I should, however, be even more undeserving of it than I feel I am, had I the hardihood to write on so important and practical a question as the order of the prayers in Mass without having first carefully studied all the authentic utterances of the Congregation of Rites, which bear on the question. I assure my esteemed critic, then, that I had read and reread all the above decrees many times before giving to the public, in 1891, in answer to a correspondent, the conclusion I had arrived at. And having again on the present occasion studied the whole question from the foundation—having consulted all the authors, ancient and modern, whose works I could find, and having weighed carefully every word in the above decrees of the Congregation of Rites, I am compelled, though reluctantly, to maintain my former position.

To prevent misconception, I will now define what my position is. 1. Though not of obligation, it is nevertheless advisable that the first prayer in the *Missa quotidiana* should be that which best suits the intention for which Mass is offered. 2. A priest discharges an obligation of celebrating a private Requiem Mass by saying the three prayers given in the *Missa quotidiana* in the order in which they are given. 3. The *Deus qui inter* must never be omitted in a Mass such as the question contemplates; and if the special prayer, as I advise, be said first, the second should be the *Deus qui inter*. 4. The second prayer, *Deus veniæ largitor*, may be omitted for the purpose of introducing the special prayer. 5. The last prayer, whether three, five, or seven be said, must always be *Fidelium*.

It will be seen from this statement of my position that I quite agree with Father Malone when he says that "any substitution for the first prayer, *Deus qui inter*, etc., or the third, *Fidelium*, etc., so far from being advisable, is positively forbidden." I not only admit, but hold most strenuously, that neither of these prayers can be omitted; but I hold also that, while the place of the *Fidelium* is defined, that of the *Deus qui inter* is not.

There is just one additional point in Father Malone's communication which calls for special notice, as the decrees which he cites are included among those given by "Sacerdos Dunensis et Connorensis;" and as it may be answered in a few words, I will do so here before proceeding to discuss the main question.

He says: "Only the prayer *Pro patre et matre* can be substituted for the second prayer, *Deus veniae, etc.*" In reply to this, it is only necessary to call his attention to the first decree given above, beginning *Presbyter Aquensis*. He will find that the concluding words of the Congregation of Rites are as follow:—" . . . aliquando pro illa, *Deus veniae largitor*, impune subrogabitur alia v. gr. pro patre, pro matre, *etc.*" This little insignificant *etc.* is regarded by all rubricists as permitting the substitution of any suitable prayer, especially of that which suits the intention for which Mass is offered. And although the first decree quoted by Father Malone is later than the decree *In Aquensi*, and makes explicit mention only of the prayer *pro patre et matre*, the *etc.* of the decree *In Aquensi* is clearly implied in the words *juxta decreta*. For as Father Malone may see from the second decree which he quotes, as well as from several of those quoted by "Sacerdos Dunensis et Connorensis," it is to the decree *In Aquensi* that the Congregation always refers regarding the prayer which may be substituted for the *Deus veniae largitor*.

I now come to the main, if not the only, question at issue; namely, whether in a private Requiem Mass, in which three prayers are said, the first *may* be that which corresponds with the intention for which Mass is offered. One of my critics reminds me that this question is decided in the negative by all modern rubricists. This I freely admit. Even prior to the decree *In Tuscanen*, issued in 1865, several writers, among whom may be mentioned Falise, De Conny, and Bouvry, taught that the first prayer should always be *Deus qui inter*, given first in the Missal. But it was not till after the publication of the above-mentioned decree that De Herdt adopted this opinion. In the fourth edition of his *Praxis Liturgiae*, published as late as 1863, he

has a special dissertation, in which he proves, against the authors I have just mentioned, that the decrees issued up to that time (1863) had by no means decided the question in their favour. But in the fifth and subsequent editions he has changed his opinion, and now teaches with the others that

“ Si plures dicantur orationes, tunc prima dicenda est *Deus qui inter Apostolicos Sacerdotes*, quae prima ponitur in Missa quotidiana.”<sup>1</sup>

What authority, then, it may very well be asked, have I for rejecting the unanimous opinion of modern rubricists, and constituting myself a court of appeal from the decision of so many able and learned judges? I reply that I have precisely the same authority now for rejecting the opinion of De Herdt and those who hold with him, as De Herdt had in 1863 for rejecting the opinion of Falise and those who held with him. These latter held that the question had been decided by the decrees published up to their time. Here is De Herdt's answer :—

“ Attamen quaestio decisa non videtur : si quidem in Academiae Liturgicae conventibus, qui auspice viro Eminentissimo Constantino Patrizi, Episcopo Albanensi, S. R. E. Cardinali, S. R. C. Praefecto et sanctissimo Domini nostri, P. P. Pii IX., Vicario Generali Romae in aedibus presbyterorum missionis prope Curiam Innocentianam habentur, ad deliberanda proponebatur die 23 Junii, 1858, sequens quaestio ad X. “ In quodam ecclesiasticorum coetu haud levis agitur quaestio circa qualitatem primae orationis in missis defunctorum quotidianis recitandae. Nonnulli enim semper orationem, *Deus qui inter apostolicos sacerdotes*, dicendam esse contendunt alii ei pro quo applicatur convenientem.” Si igitur postquam supradicta omnia illa prodierint decreta *thor* is, all the decrees on the question published up to that time (1858), *namque* all the decrees now quoted against me except the decree of 1865.] Romae adhuc deliberatur et disputatur de prima oratione dicenda in missa quotidiana de Requiem, quaestio decisa esse non debet (potest) cum non deliberetur neque disputetur de re certa et decisa, sed de ea de qua dubitatur.”<sup>1</sup>

Now, if in this extract from De Herdt, the names of Leo XIII. and Cardinal Parocchi be substituted for those of

<sup>1</sup> Tom. 1, n. 65, R. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Praxis Liturg.*, ed. 4, Tom. iii., pages 364-5.



Pius IX. and Cardinal Patrizi ; and if for June 23, 1858, be substituted January 20, 1886, I may present the extract as expressing, word for word, the authority on which I rely when I venture to differ with De Herdt and the other modern rubricists.<sup>1</sup> For on January 20, 1886, in Rome, in the house of the Lazarists or Priests of the Mission, near the Curia Innocentia, in presence of Cardinal Parocchi, Vicar General of His Holiness Leo XIII., the self-same question was discussed by members of the same *Academia Liturgica*. And if, as De Herdt argues, and conclusively argues, the discussion of the question by such a body, in such a place, in 1858, afforded proof that it was not then decided ; so, for precisely the same reason, may I argue that in 1886 the question still remained undecided, notwithstanding the decree of 1865, which De Herdt accepted as decisive. Cardinal Parocchi was present, as I have said, at the meeting at which this discussion took place, and was among those who warmly supported the opinion I am now defending, *adding that he had never had any doubt about its correctness.*<sup>2</sup>

I might rest my case solely on the authority of Cardinal Parocchi. His is not the mere authority of a parish priest, or of several parish priests combined, or of an unofficial dignitary of the Roman Church. As Vicar General of His Holiness, he is responsible for the strict observance of the ecclesiastical ordinances by the Roman clergy. His word is law ; the very manner in which he performs the ceremonies of the Church imposes an obligation on others to perform them in the same manner : and his publicly expressed interpretation of any law, or of the decree of any Congregation must be regarded as a *doctrinal* interpretation. But as it is not necessary for me to rest my case on his sole authority, so I will not ; but will now proceed to give that interpretation of the decrees which he defended, and which I feel must recommend itself to everyone who carefully studies the decrees.

<sup>1</sup> See discussion in the *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, vol. i., page 207, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, vol. i., page 216, note.

Here I should remind my readers that, though all modern writers are against, all the older writers are with me; or, rather, I am with them. Among them I may enumerate Merati, Guyetus, Lohner, Roinsee, Jansens, and Brassine; and to this list I may add De Herdt himself in the first four editions of his *Praxis Liturgicæ*. The opinion held by these classic writers on Liturgy was not merely that the special prayer for the intention for which Mass is offered *might* be substituted for the *Deus qui inter*, but that it *should* in all cases be substituted for it, and they designate any practice opposed to this a *ridiculous abuse*.<sup>1</sup> Now, as the rubrics give no directions in this matter, and as the teaching of the foremost rubricists was as above, it follows that the law, as then recognised, was that the first prayer should be for the intention for which Mass is offered. This law is neatly expressed by Merati as follows:—

“ Si missa celebretur pro aliqua vel pro aliquibus determinatis personis, primo loco dicitur oratio pro iis pro quibus missa celebratur.”

Up to the publication, then, of the first of the decrees which I am about to explain, the law on this point was clear and definite. Hence, if the Congregation of Rites wished to change that law, its decrees should show clearly and definitely that such was its intention. For no prudent man can be expected to give up an existing law about which there never was a doubt, unless the legislator makes it at least equally certain that the law has been abrogated: and *a fortiori*, without the clearest and most unmistakable evidence that such was the legislator's wish, no prudent man should abandon an existing law, and begin to observe another law directly opposed to it. Now, my contention is, that the Congregation of Rites has not clearly abrogated the law as interpreted by Merati, Guyetus, &c., and has not, therefore, promulgated a law opposed to it. This I propose now to show by pointing out the true meaning of the decrees of the Congregation.

<sup>1</sup> Cavalieri *apud* De Herdt, *loc. cit.*, page 362.

<sup>2</sup> Tom. i., pars. i., tit. v., n. xi.

The first decree is that of 1741, styled, *In Aquensi*. The question asked is twofold, but it is only the second part that concerns us. And in this part it is asked :—

“ Et oratio secunda potestne mutari, scilicet dici, verb. gr , pro patre prae notata, Deus veniae largitor ? ”

Now I beg to call attention to this question. There is not, it will be seen, a single reference in it to the first prayer; it is entirely concerned about the second prayer, and merely asks concerning this prayer, can another be substituted for it. Neither is there in the reply of the Congregation a single word capable of leading one to the conclusion that the Congregation wished to legislate about the first prayer. The reply, as given above, is :—

“ . . . aliquando pro illa, *Deus veniae largitor* impune subrogabitur alia v. gr. pro patre, pro matre, etc.”

The Congregation decides that the second prayer may be omitted, and another prayer said instead of it; but it makes no mention of the *order* in which the prayers should be said. Hence, so far, there is nothing to show that the Congregation wished to change the existing law.

The words of the second decree, “ *Quoad primam orationem servetur ordo missalis*,” being equivalent to the words *standum missali*, of the third, the same explanation will suffice for both. But, before explaining these words, let me call attention to the form in which the questions in the decree *In Briocensi*, are couched. First it is asked :—

“ *Utrum in missis quotidianis . . . teneatur sacerdos recitare primo loco Orationem pro defunctis Episcopis seu sacerdotibus ut fert missale?* ”

This is precisely the question now under discussion, and this is the first occasion on which the question was asked in a manner so definite. Now, had the Congregation wished to decide the question finally, and without ambiguity, why was the reply not *Affirmative*? Why did the Congregation content itself with the vague reply *standum missali*, unless it wished to leave the question just as it was? That this was the reason, I will show afterwards.

The second part of the question was no less definite, and admitted of a no less definite and satisfactory reply.

“Potestne primo loco recitare orationem *Inclina Domine* pro defuncto, vel orationem *Quiescantis Domine* pro defuncta, ejus ad intentionem eleemosyna data est; secundo loco pro defunctis *Episcopis*, etc., tertio loco *Fidelium*!”

Just as the former question embodies the opinion I am combating, so does this question embody the opinion I am defending. And just as the Congregation could have sanctioned the former opinion by answering in the affirmative the question containing it, so could it have condemned the latter by answering this question in the negative. *Affirmative ad primam partem, Negative ad secundam partem*, would most certainly have been the form of reply, had the Congregation wished to decide the question. But just because it wished to favour neither part, the only reply it vouchsafes is: *In missis quotidianis standum missali*.

What is the meaning of this reply? The Congregation itself will answer this question. On Sept. 11, 1847, the Congregation of Rites replied to a series of questions regarding the manner of incensing the Most Holy Sacrament. In the questions it was explained that authors, in giving directions on this point, were not agreed, and the Congregation was asked to say whether one might safely adopt any of the several methods recommended; and, if not, what method should be adopted. To this question the Congregation gave the following reply:—

“Et S. C. . . . *quin quidquam directe propositis dubiis responderet* rescribendum censuit, *Servetur Rituale Romanum*.”

Hence, on the authority of the Congregation itself, the reply *servetur Rituale Romanum* leaves the question exactly as it was; *a pari* therefore the precisely equivalent replies, *servetur ordo missalis*, and *standum missali*, leave the present question undecided one way or the other. Hence neither the second nor third decree, any more than the first, contains anything to justify us in believing that the Congregation wished to change the law as it existed up to the time these decrees were issued.

In the fourth and last of the decrees given above, two



questions are asked. First, ought a priest always (*indiscriminatum*) to say the first prayer, *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, given first in the Missal? Or, second, is he bound (*tenetur*) to say instead of it a prayer suiting the intention for which he celebrates? To the first question the Congregation replied *Affirmative*, the meaning of which is, that the prayer mentioned in the question must be said in every Requiem Mass in which more than one prayer is permitted. But there is not a word about the order in which this prayer is to be said. And regarding the necessity of saying it, there is no difference of opinion; the whole question is regarding the order in which it is to be said; and this question the Congregation left undecided, as it so often did before.

To the second question, the reply of the Congregation is *Negative*. The meaning of this reply is, that a priest is *not strictly bound* to say in the *Missa quotidiana*, a prayer suiting the intention for which he celebrates; and, hence, that he satisfies his obligation by reciting the three prayers given in the Missal. But, again, there is no word regarding the order in which the prayers should be said. All are in agreement on the point decided by the Congregation, while the Congregation vouchsafes not a word on the point about which all are not agreed. Still, then, no evidence of the abrogation of the old, or the promulgation of the new law, regarding the order in which the prayers are to be said.

One consideration more I will submit to my readers in confirmation of the opinion I am defending. When the *Missa quotidiana* is said as a Solemn Mass, or as a private Mass on one of the privileged days, only one prayer is to be said, and that prayer should be appropriate to the intention for which Mass is offered. Now when the same Mass is celebrated as a private Mass on a non-privileged day, is it unreasonable to suppose that the one prayer, permitted on other occasions, should be the first on this occasion?

D. O'LOAN.

## Correspondence.

## THE PRIVILEGE OF ADRIAN IV. TO HENRY II.

"REV. DEAR SIR.—The question of the authenticity of the Privilege of Adrian is now such a threadbare subject, one should not trespass on your valuable space except to bring forward some information or arguments that may likely be new to the greater number of your readers.

"1. With regard to the testimony of Giraldus concerning the confirmatory Brief of Pope Alexander III., it is to be observed that the Rolls edition of Giraldus's works is now completed by the republication of the *De Instructione Principum*, under the editorship of Mr. G. F. Warner, who has made a fresh transcript from the unique text among the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum. In this new edition, in place of the words which had been the cause of so much doubt and confusion, 'ab Adriano, Papa de Anglia orlando,' we read, 'Ab Alexandro tertio.' Mr. Warner adds in a note: 'So manuscript, agreeing with *P. p. III.*' The sentence then, according to the correct reading, page 51, runs as follows: 'Interea quanquam martiris plurimum intentus et distantius exercitiis, Anglorum rex suae tamen inter-agendum Hiberniae non inmemor, cum praetotatis episcopatuum litris in synodo Cassiliensi per industriam quaesitis; decessit ad curiam Romanam nuntiis, ab Alexandro tertio, tunc presidente privilegium impetravit, eundem privilegii cum universitatis assensu solennis recitatio facta fuit nec non et alterius privilegii per eundem transmissi, quod idem rex ab Adriano Papa Alexandri praedecessore antea perquisierat, per Joannem Sarisburiensem, post medium Episcopum Carnotensem, Roman ad hoc destinatum.'<sup>1</sup>

"2. Pope Innocent X., in the instructions given to the Nuncio Mucceini, endorses the testimony of his predecessors as to the deplorable state of Ireland at the time of the Anglo-Norman invasion, and states that the King of England endeavoured at the same time to bring back 'non meno ab culto civile che a quello della vera Religione i traviati Irlandesi.'<sup>2</sup>

"3. With regard to the words, 'dated at Rome, Datum

<sup>1</sup> Miss Norgate, *English Hist. Review*, January, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> Page xxxvi.

Romae,' with which the Privilege of Adrian concludes in some transcripts of the text, and on which Cardinal Moran raises an objection to the authenticity of the document, it is now certain that the words are a mere copyist's addition, and that the earliest text, that of Gerald, had no date of any kind.

"4. The testimony of the Popes themselves and of our leading English and Irish historical writers, should naturally have the greatest weight with well-informed and impartial investigators in determining their judgment as to the authenticity of the Privilege. But, for the information of those who may be more inclined to form their judgment on the 'superior' critical acumen of continental writers, it may be well to mention--- (a) that the editors of the *Regesta*, by Jaffe, owing to Irish (including Very Rev. Dr. Malone's) writing, have come to acknowledge the genuineness of the Letter and Brief of Adrian and Alexander III.; and, (b), that the unfortunate, but eminent historical scholar, Dr. Döllinger (*Pfistfabeln*, S. 79, bf.) and his illustrious and erudite opponent, Cardinal Hergenröther (*Kirche und Staat*, vii. nn. 13, &c.) may be classed as defenders of the Privilege.

"N. MURPHY, P.P."

## Document.

RULES FOR THE PIOUS ASSOCIATION OF THE HOLY FAMILY,  
PUBLISHED BY HIS EMINENCE THE CARDINAL VICAR OF  
ROME, PRESIDENT GENERAL OF THE HOLY FAMILY  
ASSOCIATION.

I. FINIS.—In brevi Apostolico *Neminem fugit*, a SSmo D. N. Leone PP. XIII, die 14 mensis Iunii, 1892, pro universo terrarum orbe promulgato, habetur, Piae Consociationi a S. Familia id esse propositum: "Familias christianas arctiori pietatis nexu sacrae Familiae devincire, vel potius omnino devovere, eo etiam consilio, uti scilicet Jesu, Maria, Joseph familias sibi deditas tamquam rem propriam tueantur et foveant;" quare omnes, quicumque ad eam pertinent societatem, oportere contendere ut "inter se colligatis fide mentibus, caritate voluntatibus, in amore

Dei atque hominum, vitam ad propositum exigant exemplar." Ad hanc facilius certiusque assequenda, Cardinalis vice sacra et ubi antistes, ab Ipso Pontifice Maximo Leone XIII Consociationis universae Praeses electus datusque Patronus, audito coetu a consiliis, haec quae sequuntur servanda decrevit.

II. ADIMPLENDA MUNERA.—(a) Cardinalis Praesidis erit, coetus sanctorum a consiliis, quando Ipsi opportunum videbitur, indicere etque praesse, litteras ad Episcopos dioecesanos, pro suis quaeque negotiis, itemque paginas aggregationis atque eiusmodi alia subscribere. Eiusdem erit parocciarum numerum ac familiarum, recipere, quae per varias orbis regiones in Piae Consociationis album fuerint adscriptae. Sacris coetibus ac religionis solemnibus, quae a Pia Consociatione celebrari in urbe contigerit, vel Ipse praerit, vel alius ab Eo sufficiendus antistes. Sui denique muneris erit, de omnibus, quae piam hanc Societatem spectent, per consiliarios suos edoceri, praesertim in iis, quae ab his possent officio fieri, vel quae aliquam difficultatem praesefere videantur.

(b) Trium quorum alter est a secretis pro tempore S. Rituum Congregationis), quos Cardinalis Praeses sibi adsevit, urbanorum Antistitem erit diligenter conventibus interesse, suam sententiam dicere, significare Praesidi si quid noverint Piae Societati profuturum, in omnia, quae ad huius bonum referantur, sedulo incumbere.

(c) His accedit Sacerdos, qui iungatur munere Secretarii Piae Societatis ad id electus a Cardinali Praeside. Huic curae erit, graviora, quae in conventibus occurrant pertractanda negotia, annotare; quae ad rei incrementum collatura duxerit, proponere; scriptis edendi, a Pia Consociatione vigilem navare operam; de omnibus ac singulis communicare cum Praeside, ut et necessaria approbatione et duplici subscriptione muniantur.

(d) Porro Sacerdos a secretis adseiscere sibi in auxilium, poterit alium Presbyterum, a Praeside adprobandum qui Secretarii vices adimpleat. Ad eum itaque pertinebit dandas ad Episcopos aliosve litteras exarare eorumque epistolis rescribere, prout a Cardinali Praeside fuerit edoctus, cui et Secretario postea tradet subscribendas. Penes ipsum erit pluteus, sive archivum, quo scripta, libellos, sacras imagines, aggregationis paginas et alia eiusmodi servabit in usum Sodalium, prout Piae Consociationis consilium constituerit. Agendas sibi expensas ipse describat et Praesidi referat, cui etiam rationem reddet.



III. EXTRA URBEM.—(a) Episcopi dioecesani erit aliquem e suis Sacerdotibus, quantum fieri possit digniorem, eligere ad munus Moderatoris, huius studium excitare in bonum Piae Consociationis quo alacriorem operam in omnibus, quae ipsum spectaverint, afferat; sedulo advigilare: ab ipso electo Moderatore de omnibus velle doceri quae ad Piae Consociationis bonum referantur.

(b) Ad dioecesanum Moderatorem pertinebit Moderatores parochiales opera et consilio iuvare, ut pari alacritate ac prudentia sese in omnibus gerant. Ab unoquoque eorum saepe numerum et nomina exquiret familiarum, quae Piae Consociationi fuerint adscriptae, de quibus edoceri deinde possit. Neque harum modo, sed et nomina descriptarum paroeciarum in tabulis recensenda curabit: mox earum exemplar ad Urbem mittet.

(c) Paroeciarum Rectores singuli Moderatoris officium inter oves sibi creditas assumant obeantque. De suae quisque Consociationis negotiis cum Moderatore dioecesano communicet, cuius auctoritate, consilio, opera iuvari possint. Familias paroeciae in sociorum numerum adscisci cupientes in tabulas referet, palamque Moderatori dioecesano faciet. Quotannis, stato die, paroeciae familias recensere studebit novasque, si fieri possit, in album Societatis inscribendas curabit. Quo autem Sacrae Nazarethanae Familiae cultus honorque foveatur magis, sermonem interdum de Pia Consociatione ad oves suas habeat, quum in festis peculiaribus Domini, Deiparae ac S. Iosephi, tum maxime quum Sodaliū pactum erit solemniter renovandum, vel etiam quum in parochiali Ecclesia religiosam aliquam eiusdem S. Familiae sollemnitatem celebrari contingat, quam et indicere et dirigere prudenti eius arbitrio relinquitur. Idem, si opportunum videbitur, auxiliares viros ac mulieres moribus et pietate praestantes in parte laboris adsumat, qui rei provehendae omni studio dent operam.

(d) Delecti ex utroque sexu rei provehendae, alteri inter viros, alterae inter mulieres, ab suo edocti Parocho, in Pia Consociationis incrementum magno studio prudentiaque incumbunt, adhibitis, quae ad rem sunt validissima, precibus, hortationibus, virtutum exemplis. Praeterea in omnibus, pro quibus eorum opera uti Parochi in Domino iudicaverint, dociles omnino se praebeant.

IV. SERVANDA A FAMILIIS ADSCRIPTIS.—(a) In honorem Nazarethanae Familiae studeat quicumque ei dederit nomen similitudinem aliquam earum virtutum adripere, quarum Iesus, Maria, Ioseph, praeclarissima in terris exempla prodiderunt,

quum omnibus tum maxime iis, qui labore manuum victum quaerunt. Sed ad illas in primis animum adiiiciant, quae sanctitatem domesticae societatis spectant, uti sunt mutua caritatis officia, praesertim inter coniuges, filiorum recta institutio horumque obedientia et obsequium in parentes, pax et concordia domi aliaque huiusmodi. Itaque a vitiis omnino caveant, ab iis maxime quae singularem intamiae notam Christiano homini iniurant, quaeque Ipsi Sacrae Familiae iniuriam videantur asferre praecipuam, cuius generis sunt impia verba aut obscena, ebrietates, incompositi mores, hisque similia.

(b) Ad Poenitentiae et Eucharistiae Sacramenta solemnioribus saltem anni diebus pie accedent, praesertim quo die Familiarum consecratio renovabitur.

(c) Ecclesiae praecepta, in tanta morum demutatione ac corruptela tam parvi habita, suaviter observari curabunt, ea potissimum ex quorum custodia aliis bona exempla derivant, uti auditio sacri festis diebus, abstinentia, praescripto tempore, a cibi vetitis, aliaque eiusmodi.

(d) Peculiari honore celebranda curabunt festa Piae Consociationis propria, quae plenaria indulgentia a Summo Pontifice tuere ditata, in primisque solemnem constitutum diem in honorem Sacrae Familiae, qui dies erit per universum orbem Dominica intra octavam Epiphaniae, quo simul, nisi aliter expedire Moderatoribus parochialibus in Domino visum fuerit, ritus consecrationis renovabitur.

(e) Dent operam ut, semel saltem in die, ante Sacrae Familiae imaginem communes fundantur preces, in quibus praecipua ratione commendatur Rosarii in honorem Deiparae recitatio.

(f) Pietatis exercitationes, quas diximus, enixe commendantur iis, qui ad Piam Consociationem pertinent, nullatenus tamen eorum onerata conscientia.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus Vicariatus, Dominica infra Octav. Epiph., die 8 Ianuarii 1893.

L. M. CARD. VIC., *Praeses*.  
C. MANCINI, *a Secretis*.

## Notices of Books.

---

A MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. Thomas Gilmartin. Vol. I. Second Edition. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; Browne & Nolan. London: Burns & Oates.

A YEAR has not yet elapsed since the death of the young author of this excellent History of the Church, and the appearance in a second edition of his first volume is sure to revive the regret so generally felt that he did not live to publish the third and final instalment of his work. We have, however, reason to hope that an able and competent historian will be found to take up the work where our late colleague left it, and to give to English-speaking students of ecclesiastical history what they have long required—an ample and complete account of the Catholic Church from its foundation to our own time. Unfinished, as it is, Father Gilmartin's work has already superseded the histories hitherto used as class-books in several Catholic colleges besides Maynooth. Its merits were acknowledged on all sides, and by the most competent critics in England and America as well as at home. Its success is, therefore, already established, and requires only the third volume to make it complete. In this second edition of the first volume some slight changes and additions have been made; but although they extend the work by thirty or forty pages, they consist chiefly in the development of a few points that were too much curtailed in the first edition. They are all, moreover, only such as were indicated in detail by the author before his death. The volume before us is very carefully edited, and is brought out with the sanction and at the request of the bishops; and all who take an interest in the matter will be glad to know that it is ready for sale.

J. F. H.

MEMOIRES, REMINISCENCES, CONFÉRENCES. De Mgr. A. Ravoux. St. Paul, Minnesota: Ledoux & Levasseur. 1892.

As a contribution to the history of the establishment of Catholicity in the United States this work must prove to be of lasting interest, especially to the Catholics of Minnesota, and of

its chief city, St. Paul. The late Dr. Gilmary Shea has left to Americans a monumental work, the like of which, had it been written in apostolic times, would now be of priceless value. Anything that serves as a supplement to that work is sure to be of great service to future historians of the Catholic Church in America, and the personal experiences and reminiscences of Mgr. Ravoux in the work before us give at first hand an account of what was done in the early times in a vast district of the wild prairies of the West. The Abbé Ravoux was a native of Auvergne in France, a province which has sent out many a missionary during the present century, especially to countries where they could expect but little comforts, and where sacrifice and danger constantly attended them. At an early age he volunteered to accompany a bishop to America as a missionary to the Sioux Indians of the prairies of Minnesota. In this volume he gives the result of long years of patient labour amongst them, and a very interesting account of their mode of life, their contentions, their superstitions, their conversion, and subsequent life as Catholics. Although there are, in addition, some conferences on controversial subjects and essays on matters of general interest to natives of Minnesota, the historical part of the work is, in our opinion, by far the most important, and is, we imagine, pretty sure to be of permanent interest.

J. F. H.

THE THEOCRACY AND THE LAW OF NATIONAL CADUCITY. A Reply to Recent Dissertations on the "Temporal Power" in the *New Review*, *Spectator*, *Contemporary Review*, &c. By the Authors of *The Civil Principality*. London: Burns & Oats.

THE author of this pamphlet maintains that the temporal power of the Pope is founded on divine right. The chief argument which he develops in support of his thesis is drawn from what he calls the law of national caducity. Kingdoms, empires, republics, come and go, but the temporal kingdom of the Papacy remains for ever, in right, if not in fact. Conquest, persecutions, insurrections, and exiles have from time to time brought to naught the civil rule of the Pontiffs, but its invariable restoration under God's Providence is a matter of history. The abstract right of sovereignty is bound up in the person of the Pope, and when that right is realised, the territory to which it extends can not be alienated or abandoned either by the Pope or the whole



Church assembled. In so far as temporal sovereignty is useful, and even necessary to the Popes for the free and untrammelled discharge of their duties to the world, it is plain that this writer has all Catholics on his side; but when he goes beyond this, and maintains that temporal sovereignty is of divine institution, and an essential appanage of the Papacy, he is not likely to secure the same unanimity. His arguments from Scripture are well developed, and he gives a very good account of his own opinion. But if he explained in the beginning of his pamphlet what exactly he understands by "*de jure divino*," he would, in our opinion, have succeeded in making his meaning much clearer in the course of his argument.

J. F. H.

THEOLOGIAE MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM.  
Auctore P. Benjamin Elbal, O.S.F. Novis Curis edidit,  
P. F. J. Bierbaum, O.S.F. Parts vi., vii., viii., ix., x.  
Paderborn : 1893.

THE reissue of this valuable work is now complete. Some time since we expressed a very favourable opinion of the early parts. Now we have to repeat this commendation. The parts recently treat of *Restitution ; Obligations of Various States in Life ; the Sacraments in general and in particular, with Censures and Irregularities*. This latter treatise is remodelled to bring it into harmony with the *Apostolicæ Sedis*. The subject-matter is always treated as a "Conference." Then follow deductions from the principles laid down in the Conference; and next come a number of practical cases to illustrate the principles and deductions. It is a most useful and practical work; and, now that it is easily attainable, we have to express a hope that it will be as extensively read as it certainly deserves to be.

M. J.

A SIN AND ITS ATONEMENT. Reprinted from the *Are Maria*. Notre Dame, Indiana.

How faith is lost by over confidence in one's own sufficiency, and how it is regained through humility and the cross, is the burden of the lesson of this handsome little volume, which has been reprinted from the pages of the *Are Maria*. The main incidents recorded in the story are strictly true and most instructive as to the result of mixed marriages to the faith of a Catholic, no matter how resolute and sincere. The *Are Maria* maintains a high literary standard, and this last production does credit both to its editors and its press.

J. F. H.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

MAY, 1893.

---

## ST. FINTAN OF RHEINAU.

AMONGST the numerous continental monasteries which owed their origin to the zeal of Irish missionaries, that of Rheinau in Switzerland holds an important place. It was founded, with the assistance of St. Fintan, by a German nobleman named Woltihart of Kyburg, about the year 800, and can trace the long list of its abbots in an unbroken line from the ninth century to the middle of the nineteenth. It was, like all the Benedictine monasteries of the same period, a great seat of learning, and a centre of refinement and civilization; but circumstances also gave it considerable influence in the political affairs of its neighbourhood during the middle ages. This influence was, in a great measure, due to its wealth and extensive possessions. In feudal times it counted many vassals amongst its tributaries, and in the eighteenth century its abbot was made, by rank and title, a prince of the Austrian empire. It survived a good many political storms, and although it suffered considerable hardship and spoliation from time to time, it was only in the year 1802, that it fell an absolute victim to the revolution. By an agreement between the governments of Germany and Switzerland its property was confiscated on both sides of the Rhine. Its monks were expelled, and its buildings appropriated for secular purposes. Its fine library, containing manuscripts, some of which date back to the ninth century its cabinet of archeology and natural history its

pictures, engravings, and articles of antique furniture, were transferred to the public library and museum of Zürich. The church alone, with its interesting frescoes and fine choir, remains in Catholic use—a memorial of the past, and a centre of hope for the future.

The history of the abbots of Rheinau, from 846 to 1777, was written by a learned Benedictine monk of the last century, Moritz Hochenbaum Van der Meer.<sup>1</sup> In the introduction to this work, the author relates how Wolffhart, a prince of the Guelf family, in the eighth century, resolved to establish and endow a Benedictine monastery on the island of Rheinau, near Schaffhausen, and how his purpose was upset by the wars which were then carried on between Gaul and Allemannia. The project was subsequently taken up by his son, Ettich, but similar circumstances interfered with its execution, and it was not till Wolffhart's grandson, and namesake had procured from Bobbio some of the relics of St. Columbanus, and had secured the co-operation of Gosbert, a learned monk of St. Gall, and of Fintan, an Irishman of the most saintly and perfect life, that the desire of three generations of Christian princes could be satisfied. The first abbot of the new monastery was Gosbert; but the monk who shed upon its young life the greatest lustre of virtue and of sanctity, and who afterwards became its patron saint, was Fintan.

The life of St. Fintan was written by an Irish monk, who seems to have been a contemporary and an intimate acquaintance of the saint. It is published in the works of Goldast and Mabillon, and is, we venture to say, one of the most interesting biographies that could well be met with. It not only reveals to us the acts and virtues of St. Fintan as a monk, but enters very minutely into the events, full of adventure, tragedy, and romance, which led to his renouncement of the world. Fintan, it tells us, was a native of Leinster

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Tausendjährigen Stiftung Des Freiceminters Gotteshaus Rheinau, Nebst einem treuen Verzeichnisse der Aebte und der Merkwürdigen Begebenheiten.* Von P. Mauritz Hochenbaum Van der Meer, Gewesenen Priorn und damaligen Secretarn der Benedictiner Congregation in der Schwceitz, 1778.

in Ireland.<sup>1</sup> His father occupied an important position in the army of a prince of that region, and was constantly engaged in warfare with the Danes, who then began to make incursions into Ireland. In one of the raids of these invaders, whilst the father and son were occupied elsewhere, Fintan's sister was taken captive by the Northmen, and carried away from Ireland. The father was overwhelmed with grief at the loss of an only daughter, but could not desert his post of command in order to go in search of her. He, therefore, commissioned Fintan to take with him a large sum of money, and endeavour by every possible means to rescue the captive. On this brotherly pursuit Fintan at once set out, taking with him an interpreter and a few companions. He had not gone far on his journey, when he fell into the hands of the Northmen, by whom he was bound in chains and kept in close confinement. His captors, however, were not altogether inhuman or inconsiderate; for when they reflected on the object of his journey, they came to the conclusion that it was not a noble thing to imprison even an enemy engaged on such an errand, and they set him free. After many adventures and narrow escapes, Fintan was compelled to abandon his project and return to Leinster.

Meanwhile, as only too often happened in these times in Ireland, a bitter feud had arisen between the King of Leinster and one of his neighbours, and in the course of the quarrel a man on the opposite side was killed by Fintan's father.<sup>2</sup> This brought upon him the wrath of the whole

<sup>1</sup> "Vir igitur quidam, nomine Fintan, genere Scottus, civis Provincie Laginensis, quibus occasionibus ad perfectionem vite perveniret, quibusque tentationibus ac laboribus sic frequenter attractus, hinc emanare, Deo favente, cogitavit. Prædicti ergo viri ororem gentilem qui Northmanni vocantur, plurimum Scottis tradidit, quæ et Hibernia dicitur, loca vastitates, inter alia, nomina, agnoscere captivam. Tunc pater ipsius filio suo Findano, præcepit ut, accepta pecunia, sororem redimeret et ad patrem reduceret. Qui sumptis secum comitibus pariter ac interprete, nequaquid implere desiderium, cumque ipse fratrem cum eo corde conservaret, in eodem mox itinere, a paganis tentus atque in vincula conjectus, necnon et ad mores ipsorum, cum multis in itinere statuit, esse ante inopem perductus."—*Itin. c. d. M. lib. ii.*

<sup>2</sup> "In eadem Laginensium provincia inter duos principes grandis orta est seditio. Unius ergo principis miles fuit pater Findani prædicti, qui de contraria parte hominem occidit: quod audiens princeps contrariæ



clan to which his victim belonged. To a man they vowed vengeance against him and all his race. They at once invaded his territory; his lands were devastated with fire and sword; his house was surrounded and set on fire in the night, and when he himself rushed forth to escape the flames, he was caught and put to death. Fintan, who occupied another house, was likewise besieged. He defended himself bravely, but when the hostile party despaired of taking the stronghold by arms, they again had recourse to fire. Fintan held his ground until the last moment, and then rushed through the flames, fought his way through the enemy, and effected his escape. A younger brother who occupied the house with Fintan was less fortunate; he was captured and slain.

We cannot be surprised when the biographer tells us that "fierce enmities and inexorable discord" arose between the parties after these terrible events. Fintan, however, was naturally a young man of peaceful disposition, and was not in favour of carrying vengeance to extremes. The opposite party also felt that they had gone beyond all natural limits, and fearing the retaliation of Fintan's clansmen, they endeavoured to make some compensation to him for the loss he had sustained. Nevertheless they distrusted Fintan's quiet demeanour. They thought he was only biding his time to strike a fatal blow. They resolved, therefore, to avert the vengeance which they dreaded, and had recourse for the purpose to one of the most infamous plots on record.<sup>1</sup> Under

partis, nimia succensus ira, continuo domum patris Findani, magno stipatus exercitu, omnia illius ipsumque ferro flammaque perditurus advixit: venientesque noctu domum armis cinxerunt, ignemque ad tecta percussit, patrem ipsius Findani de ignibus foras progredientem, jugulaverunt. Findanum vero in alia domo manentem cum similiter ignibus circumdeditissent et se pro viribus viriliter defendentem, apprehendere non valuerunt, sed ipse per medios ignes et hostes, divina videlicet gratia eum protegente, parum laesus clapsus est. Fratrem vero ejus qui in eadem domo tueretur, occiderunt. Inde igitur inter utramque gentem magnae concitiae sunt inimicitiae inexorabilesque discordiae." — *Vita S. Fintani*, Mabillon, vol. v.

<sup>1</sup> "Inito consilio Findano praeparavere convivia in locis mari contiguous; ad quae Findano invitato Nordmanni venientes et de medio convivarum ipsum rapientes sicut cum inimicis consiliati sunt, atrocissimis vineulis conligavere et secum pariter abduxere. Juxta morem ergo suum dominus ejus Nordmannus, quia necdum ad patriam suam redire cupisset, alii illum vendidit, et mox ille tertio atque ipse quarto; qui secus coactus, patriam revisere desiderans, hunc secum cum aliis in captivitatem duxit."

pretence of ending the quarrel on friendly terms, they invited Fintan to a sumptuous banquet, and when he, unsuspectingly, accepted their invitation, and was enjoying what he believed to be their hospitality, they, at a moment previously agreed upon, betrayed him to the Danes, who bound him hands and feet, and carried him away from the banquet-hall. These freebooters had many a grudge against his father and his king, and were glad to get possession of him. The chief into whose hands he fell sold him to another Scandinavian lord, he again to a third, and he to a fourth. The last purchaser of the young Irishman was just setting sail for the northern seas. When all was ready he had Fintan securely bound, and put on board his own ship as a captive.

On the voyage northwards the ships of Fintan's party were met by another small fleet, making its way to Ireland, from Denmark. The commander of this expedition sent them a messenger to inquire about the soil of Ireland and the chances of conquest. One of the sailors on the home-bound ship recognised the envoy as the murderer of his brother, and as soon as he came on board he killed him on the spot. This led to a fierce encounter between the two fleets, and in the thick of the fight poor Fintan, disarmed and bound, earnestly begged to be allowed to have a share in the combat in defence of his captain and crew. The intervention of a third squadron, however, put a stop to the struggle, and Fintan's ship was allowed to continue its course. The captain was greatly touched by the prisoner's desire to help him in the hour of danger. He had him at once released from his chains, and treated with moderation, and even kindness.

The odyssey, however, was not yet ended; stress of weather compelled the vessel to put into one of the uninhabited Orcades, or Orkney Islands, off the north of Scotland, and whilst waiting there for a favourable wind the seafarers went about to explore the island. Fintan also, in consideration for his devotion, was allowed to wander whither he would. As he was not bound by any promise or obligation to his captors, he now began to think of effecting his escape.

In a remote corner of the island there was a huge rock

hanging over the sea, and beneath it a deep cave which was barely accessible from the cliff above. Fintan crept into this recess, and awaited events in the confidence of his heart. As night came on the poor fugitive was pressed on every side. Around him all was damp, cold, and slimy. Before him the tide came on with mighty waves, and threatened to fill up the cave in which he shivered. Above him he could hear the wrathful voices of the northmen calling on him by name with hoarse curses and pagan oaths. Preferring, however, to be swept away by the sea rather than fall again into the hands of his enemies, Fintan resolved to stay motionless where he was. The whole night and part of the following day he remained in that frigid cave, without any food, the waves roaring at the cavern's mouth, and the winds howling as they only do at sea. When the tide allowed him to come forth from his hiding-place, he made his way, on his hands and knees, into a thicket of brambles, whence he could observe the land and sea. Not far off he spied a country which showed signs of life and cultivation; but the ocean intervened, and the wanderer was so exhausted with fatigue, cold, and hunger, that he could not think of swimming such a distance. For three days he went around the island, living on herbs and wild berries, which he could now search for in security, as the northmen, glad to take advantage of the tide and weather, had sailed away.

On the third day he sat down by the shore, and saw dolphins and sharks playing in the water; and as he thought of the Providence that rules the world, and provides even for dumb creatures a life suitable to their end, whilst he, a wanderer and a cast-away, was thus afflicted and abandoned, for the first time he gave way to tears. He soon, however, overcame his grief, and, taking refuge in that strong faith which in the midst of all their contentions was so remarkable a characteristic of the Irish in these days, he raised up his hands to heaven, and uttered the solemn vow which was to rescue him from danger, and to shape the course of his future life.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Deus qui et hæc bruta animalia et me hominem creasti, quique illis mare pervium et me terris tuta figere donasti vestigia, solita mihi pietate in præsentī tribulatione succurre; tibi, Domine, ab hac hora,

“O God!” he said, “who hast created these brute animals as well as me, and who hast suited them to the sea, and hast preserved them in life as Thou hast guarded me in my wanderings, with Thy usual pity, help me now in my great tribulation. To Thee, O Lord, from this hour I vow my body and soul, and declare that I shall never return to the allurements of this world. For Thy sake I shall visit the tombs of Thy holy Apostles, and travel away as a pilgrim, never to return to my native land. Thee alone shall I serve with all my strength, and never shall my eyes be turned from Thee again.”

Having thus committed himself absolutely to God, Fintan, dressed as he was, plunged into the sea, breasted the waves, and summoning his wasted strength to a supreme effort, made for the opposite shore. By the divine aid he reached land in safety, and ascending an eminence close to the beach he could see houses and smoking chimneys in the distance.<sup>1</sup> But the way to them was long and untrodden, and for two days more he wandered about, living on water, grass and roots. It was only on the morning of the third day that he came within reach of assistance. When he saw some men walking in his direction he greatly rejoiced, and hastened to address them. They, finding that he was an intelligent man, and apparently well educated, brought him to the bishop of a neighbouring town, who had made his studies in one of the schools of Ireland, and could speak the Irish language. This prelate received him with the greatest kindness, and kept him in his house for two years. Fintan,

*corpus et animam meam deo vivo servitutum et nunquam ad mundanas animi revertere inebrias: te propter lumina Apostolorum petam et peregrinationem suscipiens, ad patriam nequaquam sum reversurus: totis viribus tibi deinceps famulabo, teque sequens lumina retrorsum flectere nolo.”*

<sup>1</sup> “Ascendens igitur altissima montium cacumina, sicubi villas vel tecta rumentia cernere posset, exiguo herbarum victu bibinos iterum duxerat dies. Cum ergo tertia terris inluxisset, aurora, ecce homines eminus vidit ambulantes, quos cum vidisset, alacritate mentis exultans, licet ignotos adire non dubitavit. Tunc illi susceptum cum ad vicinæ civitatis duxerunt Episcopum, qui et ipse in Hibernia insula liberalibus erat studiis imbutus et ejusdem linguæ notitia satis eruditus: cum quo per biennium moratus, multis humanitatis atque largitates ejus beneficiis est usus.”



in the interval, was not unmindful of his vow, and as soon as the bishop consented to his departure, he took with him a few companions and set out for Gaul. He first desired to venerate the relics of St. Martin, a kindred spirit, who like himself had wielded the sword, and for that purpose he went straight to Tours. In the monastery of that city he made a short sojourn, and then continued his pilgrimage. Always on foot, he passed on through France, Germany, and Switzerland. Then, crossing the Alps, he went down through Lombardy, and finally arrived in the city of Rome, in fulfilment of his promise, whilst Pope Leo III. occupied the chair of Peter. When the pilgrim had satisfied his devotion in the Eternal City he retraced his steps northwards, and again penetrated into Switzerland. Here he remained for four years under the protection of a nobleman, who was greatly interested in the conversion and instruction of his people, and who was no other than the Wolffhart already mentioned, soon to be the founder of the monastery of Rheinau.

Impressed with the great virtues of the Irish cleric, Wolffhart thought that a most favourable time had come for the execution of his project, and with the counsel and encouragement of Fintan, the foundations of the famous monastery were laid. Fintan entered it as a simple monk, and was clothed in the habit of St. Benedict at the age of fifty-one.<sup>1</sup>

For five years, the biographer says, the Irish monk edified his brethren by every virtue, and reached from stage to stage of perfection, till at last he determined to seek even more absolute seclusion from the world, and in memory of his promise, to live alone with God the life of a recluse. He did not take this step, however, with rashness or precipitation. He frequently prayed that God might manifest His will to him on the subject; and it was only when an angel's voice distinctly conveyed to him the approval of heaven, that he yielded to his inclination.

<sup>1</sup> As an immediate preparation for his entrance to religious life at Rheinau, St. Fintan appears to have spent some time at the Benedictine monastery of Pfeffers, where his future biographer was then a monk.

It is remarkable that the author of this biography, who was an Irish monk, of the monastery of Pfäfers in the diocese of Chur, and who after St. Fintan's death, also became a recluse, probably in the very cell which Fintan himself occupied when recording the angel's words, gives them in the Irish language, although the rest of the work is written in Latin. On four different occasions<sup>1</sup> of a similar kind he repeats the same proceeding; not, we believe, through excess of patriotism, or because he thought Irish was the only language which an angel would make use of, but in order to record the exact words which were, under pressure, communicated to him by St. Fintan.

It was usually on the feast days of St. Patrick, St. Bridget, St. Aidan, and St. Columbkille, that the most important manifestations of the will of Heaven were made to him. Once on the feast day of St. Bridget<sup>2</sup> he multiplied, by a miracle, his small allowance of bread, and supplied with it a large number of people who suffered from the famine which then decimated the country. Again on the feast of St. Columbkille, the scruples which he felt at taking food produced by the labour of others were set at rest by the angel's voice. The author says, that in a future work he intends to relate in full the history of all these miracles; but if the promise was ever kept, the result has not come down to us. Nevertheless, in what he says, he gives us an insight into the

<sup>1</sup> These sentences in Irish seem very old, and probably were copied by writers who did not understand the language, and may have written them carelessly. They are to be found in Goldast, from whom Mabillon took them. They are—No. 1. "Isket duit o Dia anatheset in dabdan." No. 2. "Ardh Chrisdeus patir Atuncho, fann ioltan nakischeile leshir bat deit teile, il nakkil." No. 3. "Cruendo chach eukemdet fater, muth det futen muth de chach." No. 4. "Amine ilao ocs in naidchi ni lorge colonge ce lederemut noterfas fruihiu."

<sup>2</sup> "In festivitatem quippe Sancte Brigide virginis, non modicam pauperum turbam, ut sibi quis erit, collegit. Cernens totam quam habuit iuxta numerum adgregatam, partitionem inter se precipit: hoc autem facto cum tanti pauperes ut aderant approposce venissent. Vir vero beatus in ecclesia eorum Deo gratias agens, particulas quas ad numerum prius commemoratum parare possit, in Dei largitate conditis, qui quinque patres cum quinque mille virorum multiplicavit, distribui fecit. Sed licet cunctas gentiumque corporum ut nihil de carnibus vel ab illo vel a quopiam alderetur, uniusque tantum sua portio ex cetera commenda inveniebatur."—*Vita apud Mabillon.*

sort of life which the hermit led; and there is not much to be read of in the lives of the fathers of Egypt or Asia Minor more austere and unearthly than what he records of Fintan. Like them, the Irish saint was made a special object of attack by the enemies of mankind. Legions of demons surrounded his cell. He could see them on the ground and in the trees. The very air was filled with their horrid cries.<sup>1</sup> In Fintan, however, the words of Cardinal Newman were literally realised :—

“ But when some child of grace, angel or saint,  
Pure and upright in his integrity  
Of nature, meets the demons on their raid,  
They scud away, as cowards from the fight.  
Nay, oft hath holy hermit in his cell,  
Not yet disburdened of mortality,  
Mocked at their threats and warlike overtures ;  
Or dying, when they swarmed like flies around,  
Defied them, and departed to his Judge.”<sup>2</sup>

For twenty-two years the hermit lived in his secluded cell, apart from the world, holding outward converse only with the poor, who sometimes came to ask him for alms, and with the confessor who visited him from the neighbouring monastery. Then, as the Latin so forcibly expresses it, “ after having subdued his body by unheard-of abstinence ”<sup>3</sup> his stormy life came to a peaceful end.

The miracles due to his intercession did not, however, cease with his life. They were continued over his grave, and became so remarkable that the fame of the dead recluse spread far and wide, and that the people of the district unanimously venerated him as a saint. His claim to this honour was, moreover, not only admitted, but confirmed by the Holy See. Father Van der Meer, the historian of the monastery, tells us that when Notker, the eleventh Abbot of

<sup>1</sup> “ Inklusus vero tantam multitudinem spirituum immundorum noctu conspexit ut terram simul et arbores, quas Rhenus hinc inde cingit, implere viderentur. Cumque diu horribonas darent voces, sancti viri precibus disparuerunt et ulterius illi nusquam comparuerunt.”—*Vita apud Mabillon.*

*Dream of Gerontius.*

<sup>3</sup> “ Inaudita abstinentia corpus perdomuit.”

Rheinau, visited Rome, about the year 1000, he brought the cause of St. Fintan before the tribunal of the Holy See; and that, as a result, the saint was duly canonized. Thenceforward he was venerated as the patron of the monastery.<sup>1</sup>

In the choir of the Church of Rheinau the grave of St. Fintan is still pointed out. On one side of it lies Wolffhart, the founder of the monastery; and on the other, a son of the Emperor Rudolf, who was drowned in the Rhine. A chapel was also built over the cell of the saint, and was handsomely decorated by the forty-fifth abbot of the monastery, Bonaventure I., Prince of Wellenberg.

Although the people of the little town of Rheinau and of the neighbourhood around it have remained strong in the Catholic faith, the scene of so many religious events is now comparatively desolate. The mountains look down as of old on the island in the water, and the river flows by it with the same rapid and sometimes angry current. But the chant of the monks of St. Benedict, that resounded here for eleven centuries, is no longer heard. The church is silent and unfrequented. The memory only of its history calls up a solemn thought to the peasant or the visitor. But even though it should never revert to its rightful owners or to its original purpose, the name of St. Fintan is indelibly impressed on the region around it; and when all else has vanished of the old religious establishment of the island, the name and influence of St. Fintan will remain. From the day that the Church enrolled him on her calendar, his immortality was assured. And as for the establishment which he protected so long, it can only be said that when the spirit of faith is impeded or

<sup>1</sup> "Da Notheran dem Kaiserlichen Hofe so glücklich war, wandte er sich ebenfalls um das Jahr 1000 zum Papstlichen Stuhle, damit unser selige Mitbruder Fintan welcher bisher seine verehrung zu Rheinau hatte, durch den höchsten ausspruch der Zahl der Heiligen einverleibet würde. Von diesen Jahrhundert an, wurde dessen Fest mit mehreren Gespänge gefeiert besondere Tagzeiten verfertigt, eine Capelle an dem Orte seiner eignen Clause, worinne er die letzten Jahre zugebracht hatte, aufgerichtet und seine Verehrung in die Ferne ausgebreitet. Wie denn um diese Zeit sein Fest in der Reichenau und noch mehreren Orten sowohl des Constanzer, als Churer Bischothums, gehalten worden."—*Geschichte des Gottes-haus Rheinau*, page 52.



checked in one part of the Catholic world, it easily finds an outlet in another. It is thus that the Swiss monks, whose ministry was thwarted at home, transferred the scene of their activity beyond the seas. Like the early fathers of their order, they directed their energies to the reclamation of the savage races who know not yet the Christian law. They pitched their tents in the primeval forests of Indiana, Dakotah, and Arkansas, where one of them now rules as bishop of a vast region on which civilization is rapidly gaining; and another, *Fintan Mundweiler*, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Menrad, in Spencer County, Indiana, directs the missions of his brethren to the Indians and distant settlers of the Far West.

J. F. HOGAN.

#### SOME REMARKS ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

IT is, we believe, unanimously held that the four Gospels received by the Church of Christ were written in the order in which they occur in the New Testament. But, although there is an entire assent on the subject so far, there is not a like assent as to the exact dates at which the Gospels actually appeared. The divergence of opinion herein is not, however, very wide. It is generally admitted that the Gospel of St. Matthew was given to the world about the year 40, or shortly afterwards; that of St. Mark, about ten years later; and that of St. Luke, a few years later still. With regard to the Gospel of St. John, the authorities, with very few exceptions, combine in declaring that it appeared about the very close of the first century. The few who hold a different view, found their argument on a text in the fifth chapter of that Gospel, where it is said: "Now there is at Jerusalem a pond called Probatia, which in Hebrew is named Bethesda, having five porches." The evangelist, they say, could not use language of this kind, if he had not written before the destruction of Jerusalem, because by that event

was destroyed every such monument in the city. It is not unusual, however, to speak in the present tense of things which have passed away; and hence, the text offers no sufficient reason why we should depart from the common opinion on the subject.

We may, therefore, assume that St. John wrote his Gospel nearly half a century after the last written by the others had appeared. Now this fact of itself is a sufficient indication that he was moved to give it to the world by a feeling that there was some great want to be supplied; and we could thus conclude *a priori* that the subject-matter of his book would be quite different from that contained in those of the other evangelists. Even a slight inspection of the Gospels will show this conclusion to be true.

If we except a few things in the beginning of each, the narratives of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke are very much the same. The likeness between the writings of the two former is, indeed, so striking that it is pretty commonly said St. Mark merely wished to furnish a compendium of what had been already given by St. Matthew. St. Luke relates several things which were not even alluded to by either, and, of course, to that extent he is unlike to them. Notwithstanding, if we read his book attentively, we shall find that it is, in the main, like to those of the two evangelists just named. The case, however, is wholly different with regard to the Gospel of St. John. In his narrative we shall find an almost complete newness of subject-matter. Hence, if we look to the footnotes of the different columns in the Testament, we may observe that, whereas in the case of the first three Gospels the references to each other are very numerous, in the case of the text of St. John the references to them are very few; and even with regard to these few, they usually direct us not to an identical statement of fact, but to something kindred or explanatory.

All who have devoted any attention to the study of the Gospels must have read what we have just been stating, and must have recognised its truth. We believe, however, that comparatively few readers have perceived the full extent of this truth; in other words, how completely

St. John differs from the other evangelists with regard to the subjects narrated. Now, to show the almost complete difference in this respect is the principal aim of the present paper. We think we can best accomplish our purpose by calling attention, in the first place, to some general characteristics of the Gospel of which we are treating, and by then pointing out how its successive chapters supply to us matter altogether different from that contained in the books of the other evangelists.

We suppose that we may put down, as the first characteristic of the Gospel of St. John, the well-known fact that therein he so emphatically and repeatedly asserts the divinity of Christ. We have, indeed, his own express words that the affirmation of this was the great motive which influenced him to write. At the end of his second last chapter he says: "But these things were written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, you may have life in Him." Such was his purpose, and this purpose he kept in view throughout. He is appropriately called the Eagle of the Evangelists, from the fact that he begins his book with an account of the divine genealogy of our Lord. He thus, as it were, takes at once the wings of the eagle, soars up to heaven, enters therein, becomes acquainted with its secrets, and then reveals them to the world, setting out with the declaration: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;" and what he thus expressed in the commencement, he repeated in many places and in many ways to the end. In the course of the first chapter he cites the testimonies of John the Baptist, wherein the precursor emphatically declared the Christ was the Lamb of God and the Son of God. In the third chapter he cites the testimony of Christ Himself to the same effect, who, speaking to Nicodemus, affirmed: "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have life everlasting." We have most emphatic testimonies to the same effect in several of the chapters which follow; notably in the fifth, where the Redeemer, in proof of His divinity, appeals to the testimony of John the Baptist, to that of the miracles

which he performed, and to that of the Father; notably also in the eighth and tenth chapters, in the latter of which Christ declared that He and the Father are one. These are some of a series of testimonies and declarations which our Evangelist adduces to show the divinity of his Master, the proof of which was the chief aim of his Gospel.

What we propose to our readers as the second characteristic of this Gospel is, that we find therein the discourses of our Lord given at great length, while we find comparatively few of the other incidents connected with His career on earth. If we except the first two chapters, and those at the end, descriptive of the Passion and Resurrection, we shall find the rest chiefly devoted to the relation of various discourses delivered by the Redeemer. We have thus fully fifteen chapters (iii.-xvii.) mostly taken up in this way; and in the greater number of them we find little else. It is worthy of notice here that, whereas St. John gives us so many discourses of our Lord, he gives none of the parables. This is explained by many on the ground that the former evangelists wrote principally for the Jews, who were greatly pleased with this style of discourse, while St. John wrote quite as much for the Gentiles, who did not esteem it so highly.

Besides the discourses, St. John mentions comparatively few of the other things connected with Christ's career on earth. For instance, he tells us only of six of the very many miracles performed by Him before His death. These are:—the change of the water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee; the cure of the ruler's son, who was sick at Capharnaum; the cure of the man in Jerusalem, who had been eight-and-thirty years labouring under infirmity; the miracle of the loaves and fishes, by which our Lord so wondrously provided for the wants of the five thousand people who had followed Him into the desert; the giving sight to the man who had been born blind; and, finally, the raising of Lazarus from death to life. These are the only miracles performed by the Redeemer before His death, which are mentioned by St. John. They are, of course, most important; but they are few in number compared with those given in each of the other Gospels.



The fact to which we wish to call attention as the third characteristic of the Gospel of which we are writing is, that it is almost entirely taken up with the narrative of events and discourses which had taken place in Jerusalem or some part of Judea. In fact, if we except what is narrated at the end of the first and in the beginning of the second chapters; and if, in addition, we except what is given in chapters iv., v., vi., and xxi., the remainder of the text is occupied with things which had taken place in Jerusalem or its neighbourhood. This happens of necessity, considering the scope and aim of the writer. He wished particularly, as we observed above, to give the discourses of our Lord; and these discourses were, for the most part, delivered in the great city, which was the capital of Palestine and the centre of the Jewish worship. The three other evangelists give very many of the miracles and other events connected with the life of Christ passed over by St. John, and these miracles and events took place in great part in Galilee.

The fourth general characteristic of this Gospel is that nearly half the book is occupied with the relation of events which had taken place immediately before the death of Christ or during the forty days after His resurrection. There are but twenty-one chapters in all, and ten of them are devoted in this way.

We have only to notice one other characteristic of the Gospel of St. John; namely, its style. Now, with regard to the style, there is a perfect consensus of opinion about it. All agree that it is lofty and sublime, and thus suited to the subject on which the great Evangelist undertook to write. It is worthy of attention in connection with this matter, that, although all the sacred writers penned their histories, or poems, or prophecies, under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit, this did not interfere with a style of expression peculiar to each. That style varied with disposition, genius, education, associations, and other things which influence the individual. Now, the style of St. John is noted by all critics for its emphasis, vigour, and sublimity. A multitude of passages might be cited in illustration of this, if space

permitted. We have already observed how he is called the Eagle of the Evangelists. He is also termed the Isaias among them, inasmuch as he bears the same relation to the rest which Isaias does to the other prophets. Isaias excels among the latter by his splendour, vehemence, and sublimity; and by precisely the same qualities does John excel among the former.

We have now come to what we said was the principal object of this paper; namely, to show how completely different is the subject-matter of the Gospel of St. John from that contained in the others which had already been given to the world. What we have been stating hitherto must have prepared our readers to understand all this. We have referred to the fact that St. John's Gospel appeared nearly half a century after the last of the others. We have also called attention to the characteristics which distinguish it. Now, these things combine to show that the Saint, in proceeding to write, was actuated by the desire of supplying certain important matters which had been omitted by the other evangelists, whilst omitting what had been duly supplied by them. He observed this practice faithfully throughout; and hence we find that all his chapters, except those descriptive of the Passion and Death of Christ, contain some important matter not hitherto committed to Scripture. This, however, can be fully elucidated only by an outline of particular chapters.

In the beginning of the first chapter we have an affirmation of the divine genealogy of Christ:—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Then after an interval of three verses, wherein there is mention of John the Baptist, and of how he was sent to give testimony, we have a return to the original subject; and the first part of the chapter concludes with the memorable sentence:—"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us; and we have seen His glory, the glory, as it were, of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Now, this solemn and formal averment of the divinity of Christ in the beginning of his Gospel is peculiar to St. John. Peculiar to him also are the remarkable

testimonies of the Baptist to the same effect, which he cites in confirmation of what he himself had declared. These testimonies are found in the same chapter, vv. 19-36, and were given by the Precursor partly in response to the questions which the Jews had put to Him through their legates whom they had sent from Jerusalem for that purpose, and partly as remarks to those who stood around. Therein the Baptist declared, in the most solemn and emphatic manner, that Christ was the Son of God and the Lamb of God; and hence they were fittingly adduced by the Evangelist in confirmation of the testimony which he himself had just given. Throughout this whole first chapter we meet with matter which is found only in the Gospel of St. John. Thus, towards the end, we have the first call of Andrew and Peter, as well as the call of Philip and Nathanael, incidents passed over by the other evangelists.

In this Gospel, too, we have the sole account of the marriage at Cana of Galilee, and of the celebrated miracle performed there by the Redeemer, when He changed the water into wine. The whole incident is given at considerable length in the second chapter. It is remarkable as being the narrative of the first miracle performed by our Lord. It was performed by Him at the request of His mother, and, as He Himself declares, before His hour was yet come. The driving of the sellers of oxen and sheep and of the money-changers out of the Temple, mentioned towards the end of the same chapter, is also peculiar to St. John.

In the following chapter (iii.) we have mention of another most important matter passed over by the former evangelists, namely, the well-known discourse of Christ with Nicodemus; in which the Redeemer so emphatically declared the necessity of Baptism. It is usually held that Christ instituted this sacrament when He Himself was baptised by the Precursor in the waters of the Jordan. Its necessity, as we have just observed, is here declared in the most forcible language. It is, however, the common belief that the obligation of receiving it did not strictly come into force until after the descent of the Holy Ghost.

The well-known discourse of Christ to the Samaritan

woman is also peculiar to this Gospel. It is given at great length in the fourth chapter. The Redeemer found it necessary, as we are told in the text, to pass through Samaria. He came to a city of that province called Sichar, near the land which Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Jacob's well was there; and our Lord, being wearied with His journey, sat thus on the well. It was about the sixth hour, or the noon of the day. The Samaritan woman came to bring away water; and Christ asked her to give Him to drink. This led to the discourse between them, in which discourse we learn a good deal of the unfriendly relations then existing between the Jews and the Samaritans, and of their controversies regarding the proper place for adoring God by sacrifice. In this same chapter we have a remarkable discourse of the Redeemer to His disciples about the work that awaited Him and them.

His fifth chapter describes a most important event, for the narration of which we are also solely indebted to St. John. Therein we have an account of that great miracle by which our Lord restored in an instant the man who had been eight-and-thirty years labouring in infirmity. The Evangelist gives a detailed and complete account of this miracle. In the introduction he speaks of a pond at Jerusalem *called* Probatica, the waters of which at certain times used be miraculously moved by the descent of an angel, after which descent and movement the first infirm person who was immersed therein was cured of any infirmity under which he or she might be labouring. The Evangelist then mentions the discourse which took place between Christ and the infirm man, and declares how the latter was instantly cured when our Lord addressed to him the words: "Arise, take up thy bed, and walk." We noticed in the beginning how the words with which the Evangelist commences this narrative are relied on by those who hold that he wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem, and how the argument should not be admitted. After the account of the miracle performed by our Saviour on this occasion, we are told in the text how the Jews would persecute him, because He did these things on the Sabbath. Then we have a lengthened discourse of the



Redeemer in His own defence. In this discourse He declared emphatically that He was the Son of God, and adduced the strongest proofs in truth of this assertion; namely, the testimony of John the Baptist, that of the miracles which He performed, and that of the Father given when the Holy Ghost descended on Him after His baptism in the Jordan. The narrative of these most important events is found only in the Gospel of St. John.

In the following chapter (vi.) we have the sole mention of a matter unspeakably more important—the promise of the Blessed Eucharist. The early part of this chapter contains an account of that celebrated miracle of our Lord by which with five loaves and two fishes He provided for the wants of the five thousand people who had followed Him into the desert. The account of this same miracle is also given by the three other evangelists, but there were special reasons why it should be given by St. John. Firstly, the relation of it was in some way necessary to explain the circumstances under which the Redeemer gave the promise of the future institution of the Eucharist; secondly, this miracle, by which our Lord provided for the corporal wants of the multitude in the desert, was a type, or at all events a pledge, of that greater miracle by which He daily provides for the spiritual wants of His followers in the Holy Communion. The actual institution of this divine sacrament at the Last Supper is duly given by the other evangelists, but is omitted by St. John. The promise, however, which is omitted by them is given in full by him in this sixth chapter. In this we have, perhaps, the most notable example of what is usually assigned as one of the principal motives which induced him to write his Gospel; namely, to supply the narrative of things which had been passed over by those who had written before him, while he omitted the events which had been duly described by them.

The seventh chapter of his Gospel also gives events mentioned by him alone. Therein we find how Christ went up in secret to Jerusalem on the Feast of Tabernacles, and what happened on His arrival there. The Tabernacles, with the Pasch and Pentecost, were the great festivals of the

Jews. It had its name from the fact that it was instituted in memory of the journey of the Israelites through the desert, during which they lodged in tents or tabernacles. Being celebrated every year on the fifteenth and following days of the seventh Jewish month, it was also regarded as a suitable occasion to offer solemn and public thanksgiving to God for the ingathering of the crops. The octave during which the celebration lasted was a time of great rejoicing, and the public sacrifices were more numerous than those prescribed for any other festival. Although Christ at this time went up from Galilee to Jerusalem in secret, He spoke publicly in the Temple during the festival days. The Evangelist mentions the conflict of opinion regarding Him and His doctrine which existed among the people present, the words which He addressed to them, and the discussions and controversies consequent thereon.

During the visit of our Lord to Jerusalem on this occasion, His enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, had become quite infuriated, and sought by every means to discredit Him with the people. They would now even put Him to death, if they could do so. One well-known contrivance by which they sought to injure Him in the public estimation is given in the eighth chapter of St. John, and only there. They bring before Him a woman taken in the sin of adultery, and they said to Him: "Master, this woman was even now taken in adultery. Now, Moses in the law commanded us to stone such a one. But what sayest Thou?" This, as the Evangelist remarks, they said tempting Him, that they might accuse Him. As the commentators explain to us, His enemies considered they would have a good plea for an accusation no matter what answer He would give. If He declared the woman should be acquitted, they could then accuse Him of violating the law of Moses; and if He ordered her to be stoned, they could reproach Him with cruelty. Our Lord, who, of course, clearly saw what they intended, did not give His reply at once. They repeated the question, and then He answered them in the well-known words: "He that is without sin amongst you, let him cast the first stone at her." His enemies being discomfited went away one by

one. The Redeemer, having been thus left alone with the delinquent, pardoned her, and addressed to her the words : "Go, and now sin no more." In the course of the same chapter we find several other beautiful sentences uttered by the Saviour, sentences which the saints ever since have loved to recall and to meditate on.

We continue to give a summary of what is special to the Gospel of St. John accordingly as it occurs in each successive chapter. Almost every chapter contains something of great importance not hitherto recorded, to which not even a reference was made by the former evangelists ; and thus it happens that the book almost throughout contains something new. The ninth chapter is no exception to the general rule. We find related therein the cure of the man who was blind from his mother's womb, and who acquired sight through the miracle which Christ performed in his favour. After the account of the miracle itself we have the account of the events which followed in connection with it : how the man was brought before the Pharisees ; the interrogations which they put to him and to his parents ; the answers given ; the conduct of the Pharisees thereon ; and lastly, the great faith shown by him who was thus miraculously cured of his blindness.

We have already remarked, that one thing which makes St. John peculiar among the evangelists, is that he gives so many of the discourses of Christ, and gives them at length, whilst the number of other facts mentioned by him is comparatively small. This is particularly observable in the tenth chapter, which, with the exception of the mention of some interruptions from the Jews, is wholly taken up with our Lord's discourses. They were delivered towards the end of the occasion on which happened the events recorded in the chapters immediately preceding, namely, after Christ had gone up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles. In the beginning of this tenth chapter we have the well-known figure, in which our Lord compares His Church to a sheep-fold, and Himself to the shepherd. He graphically gives the qualities which distinguish the good shepherd from the hireling. At the conclusion of the comparison we have the

celebrated text, which is so justly adduced to prove the unity of the Church of Christ: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring: and they shall hear My voice: and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

In the two following verses (17 and 18) the Saviour gives expression to two truths which, combined, create a theological difficulty. "Therefore," says He, "does the Father love Me: because I lay down My life, that I may take it up again. No man taketh it away from Me; but I lay it down of Myself: and I have power to lay it down, and I have to take it up again. This commandment have I received of My Father." These words declare, firstly, that the death of Christ was of His own free will; and secondly, that He had received from the Father a commandment to die. The same truths we find also expressed elsewhere. The former, by Isaiah. liii. in his celebrated prophecy about the death of Christ: "He was offered up, because He Himself wished it;" the latter, by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians dii. where he says: "Christ was made obedient unto death, even unto the death of the Cross." Obedience presupposes a command. Now the difficulty is, how could Christ have received a commandment from the Father, and also be free, since He could not possibly transgress? The most satisfactory solution seems to be, that although He had received the commandment, He could obtain a dispensation from it; and thus he was free to lay down His life or not.

The circumstances connected with the death and resurrection of Lazarus are given at much length in the eleventh chapter of St. John, and are not recorded elsewhere in the Gospels. Lazarus was the last of the three whom Christ is mentioned to have raised from the dead. The other two, of whose restoration by Him to life we read, were the son of the widow of Naim, mentioned by St. Luke; and the daughter of Jairus, mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. It does not follow that, because we have an account in the Testament of these three alone, they were the only persons whom Christ during His career on earth restored from death



to life. The following in reference to this subject is read in the Office of St. Monica (4th May): "*Tres autem mortuos invenimus a Domino resuscitados visibiliter, millia invisibiliter. Quot autem mortuos visibiliter suscitaverit quis novit?*"

The sojourn of the Redeemer in and about Jerusalem on the occasion of the events noticed in the chapters immediately preceding lasted from October to December. It was marked, as we have observed, by most important incidents. The most memorable was the restoration of Lazarus from death to life. From that time, as mentioned in the Gospel, the chief priests and Pharisees were determined to put our Lord to death. His time, however, was not yet come. He went back again to Galilee, where He spent the greater part of His life on earth, and stayed there during the remainder of the Winter and early Spring.

When giving the general characteristics of the Gospel of St. John, we called attention to the fact, that nearly half the book, fully ten chapters, is taken up with the narrative of events which had taken place immediately before the death of Christ, and during the forty days while He remained on earth after His Resurrection. The mention of these events thus begins with the twelfth chapter. As we have just observed, after the occurrence of the facts told in chapter eleven, Christ went back from Judea in Galilee. Here He remained about three months, and then returned to Judea some days before His death. The twelfth chapter contains an account of what then began to take place; but as it has nothing peculiar to the Gospel with which we are concerned, with the exception of some well-known words spoken by our Lord, we need not delay to make any remarks about it.

Neither is there any occasion to delay on the chapter which follows. We may, however, bring under the notice of our readers, that it tells us how at the Last Supper Christ washed the feet of His disciples, which important fact is not given by the other evangelists. It is rather commonly believed that the primary reason which influenced the Saviour to do this for His disciples was to convey to them and to all His followers to the end of time a practical

lesson of humility. Our theologians, however, teach that the primary reason why He did so, was to show by this cleansing of the body the purity of soul required for what was about to take place; namely, the reception of the Holy Eucharist. He, however, took occasion therefrom to give to them a lesson on the necessity of humility, and spoke to them the remarkable and well-known words: "You call Me Master and Lord: and you say well, for so I am. If then, I, being your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you ought to wash the feet of one another. For I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so you do also. Amen, amen, I say to you, that the servant is not greater than his lord, neither is the apostle greater than He that sent him." In this thirteenth chapter we have also mention of the betrayal of our Lord about to be perpetrated by Judas. This is not peculiar to St. John, for we find it given by the other evangelists. There are, however, some things given in connection with it which are peculiar to him: notably, how Peter beckoned to himself, who was then reclining on the bosom of Christ, to ask who would betray Him.

In the following chapters (xiv.-xvii.) we have a lengthened account of two most important matters; namely, the discourse which our Lord delivered to His disciples, and the prayer which he prayed for them at the Last Supper: and for the relation of the one and the other we are indebted to St. John. If we look to the discourse we shall find therein several utterances of the Redeemer which His true followers have ever loved, and will ever love, to call to mind and to meditate on. He declares, in the course of that discourse, that "He is the way, the truth, and the life; and that no one cometh to the Father except by Him." Having been questioned by the disciples about this declaration, He used the words: "He that seeth Me, seeth the Father . . . . Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you, I speak not of Myself; but the Father that abideth in Me, He doth the works." These words of the Saviour express the distinction of the Personality and the unity of the Nature Divine. They also express that

indwelling of the Divine Persons in each other which theologians call *circumincession*.

In the discourse at the last supper the Redeemer also gave and repeated the promise of sending the Paraclete. We have reference to this in not less than four different places ; and in one of them we find the remarkable words : "The Paraclete whom the Father will send to you in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to your minds whatsoever I have said to you." Herein also we find the beautiful metaphor in which Christ calls Himself the vine, and the disciples the branches : "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, except you abide in Me. I am the Vine ; you are the branches. He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit, for without Me you can do nothing."

The great commandment of charity is also most specially insisted on by our Lord in this last discourse. He repeats it again and again, declaring emphatically that it is *His* commandment, and that by the observance of it His true disciples would be known to all men. We have given the foregoing as deserving of special notice among the many things which the Redeemer said to His disciples at the Last Supper, but several other beautiful sayings might be cited ; and the whole discourse could not be read too frequently. After it we have the prayer offered by our Lord to the Father for the same disciples, which prayer occupies the whole of the seventeenth chapter.

In the two following chapters (xviii., xix.) are described the Passion and Death of Christ. The description of these events, given by St. John, does not much differ from the descriptions contained in the pages of the former evangelists. This is only what we might expect. The subject being of such supreme importance, the inspired writers would be inclined to give it at length. They would also be inclined to mention every remarkable incident ; and hence their narratives should necessarily be to a great extent the same. We may, however, notice a few matters to which our Evangelist somewhat more forcibly calls attention than those who had preceded him. These are, the words addressed by our Lord

to those who had come to the garden to apprehend Him; the words which passed between Him and Pilate at the judgment-place of the latter; and the crowning of our Lord with thorns, which is mentioned in a manner specially emphatic. There is also one most important matter in connection with the death of Christ recorded by St. John for which we are indebted to him solely, as it is altogether passed over by the other evangelists. The fact to which we now refer is, that the Redeemer, having seen from the cross His mother and the disciple whom He loved, He recommended them to each other, saying to His mother: "Woman, behold thy son;" and then saying to the disciple: "Behold thy mother."

St. John devotes two chapters to tell us about the Resurrection, and about what happened during the forty days which Christ afterwards spent on earth; each of the other evangelists devotes only one chapter to the narrative of the same. In these two chapters also we have mention of some most important matters omitted in the former Gospels. One of them is the institution of the Sacrament of Penance. The occasion on which Christ instituted this Sacrament is also referred to by St. Luke; but that writer does not tell us anything about its actual institution. It is given by St. John, together with the attendant circumstances, in chapter xx.: "Now when it was late the same day, the first day of the week, and the doors were shut where the disciples were gathered together for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and said to them, Peace be with you. And when He had said this, He showed them His hands and His side. The disciples therefore were glad when they saw the Lord. He said, therefore, again to them, Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When He hath said this, He breathed upon them; and He said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained." Such are the words by which Christ our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Penance. We do not know from the sacred text whether He instituted any of the other Sacraments during the forty days which He spent on earth after His resurrection. But although we do not



know the time or the circumstances of the institution of some of them in particular, we know with the certainty of faith that during His career on earth Christ our Lord instituted all the seven.

In this same chapter, we have mention of the incredulity and subsequent faith of the Apostle Thomas. He was not present with the other Apostles on the occasion just referred to. When the others had told him of what had happened, he said: "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the place of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe." After eight days, the Redeemer again appeared to them all, and gave to Thomas the proofs which the latter said he required. Thomas then declared his faith, exclaiming: "My Lord and my God." Then Christ addressed to him the well-known words: "Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed. Blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed."

In chapter xxi., the last in this Gospel, we have an account of another apparition of our Lord to His disciples. The place was the Sea of Galilee, so often mentioned in the New Testament. The disciples, seven in number, were fishing there; and Christ stood on the shore, and said to them: "My children, have you any meat?" And they answered: "No." Then follows an account of the miraculous draught of fishes; of how the beloved disciple recognised his Master; and of how Peter, when he received the intimation of the Redeemer's presence, cast himself into the sea to reach Him the sooner.

On this same occasion took place another most important event, given solely by St. John, the notice of which shows how carefully he carried out to the end one great purpose he had in writing his Gospel; namely, to place on record several great and remarkable events which had been omitted by the evangelists who preceded him. As already mentioned, we have a notable instance of this in regard to the Eucharist, the promise of which having been omitted by the former evangelists, is given by John; and the institution of which, having been given by them, is omitted by him. Now we have another notable instance here, and it regards the primacy

of St. Peter. St. Matthew (xvi. 18, 19) gives the emphatic words in which Christ promised to him this greatest office in the future Church : " And I say to thee, that thou art Peter ; and upon this rock will I build My Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Now St. John nowhere mentions this promise, but he gives the fulfilment of it in his last chapter, when speaking of the occurrence at the Sea of Galilee just referred to. In connection with the event, he narrates the following : " When, therefore, they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these ? He said to Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me ? He saith to Him again, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My Lambs. He said to him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me ? Peter was grieved, because He said to him the third time, Lovest thou me ? and he said to Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things ; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him, Feed My sheep." In the words which the Redeemer addressed to Peter on this occasion, He actually conferred on him that primacy in the Church, heretofore so solemnly promised.

From the beginning to the end of his Gospel our Evangelist consistently carried out two great purposes ; namely, to prove clearly the divinity of Christ, and to supply the record of several important events omitted in the writings of those who had preceded him in the same course. It, therefore, necessarily happened that his book would be almost completely different from the books of the three other evangelists—the very fact whose demonstration we proposed and followed out as the principal aim of the present paper.

JOHN CARROLL, P.P.

## MGR. DE MAZENOD, FOUNDER OF THE OBLATES OF MARY IMMACULATE.<sup>1</sup>

CHARLES JOSEPH EUGENE DE MAZENOD was born at Aix, in Provence, on August 1st, 1782. On his father's side he was descended from a family of lawyers ennobled in the middle of the seventeenth century, while his mother's family had for many generations followed the profession of medicine. While he was yet a child the great tempest broke over France, and spread into the neighbouring countries. The Mazenod family was compelled to fly successively from Aix, from Nice, from Turin, from Venice, and from Naples. Their last place of exile was Palermo. While they were there Bonaparte became First Consul, and made his peace with the Holy See. Thousands of *émigrés* now availed themselves of the opportunity to return to France. Madame De Mazenod hastened to be one of the number. Eugene parted from his Sicilian friends with regret, and landed at Marseilles on October 25th, 1802. He was now twenty years old. More than half his life had been spent in exile. He had gone away a mere child: he returned a man.

Great, indeed, must have been the joy of the nobles and clergy that their hard struggles in foreign lands were at an end; that they could visit once more their old familiar haunts, and meet the friends from whom they had so long been parted. But sorrow must have taken the place of their joy as each made his way through his once stately park now shorn of its trees and turned into a desert; as he gazed on his ruined chateau, sacked and burned by the mob; as he knelt to pray amidst broken arches and mutilated monuments where once a cathedral had been. Far keener must have been their grief as they looked in vain for the dear and venerable faces which had once lent additional charm and

<sup>1</sup> *Monseigneur De Mazenod, Evêque de Marseille, Fondateur de la Congrégation des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie Immaculée, 1782-1861.* Par Mgr. Ricard. Paris: Poussielgue. 1892.

sanctity to those scenes, and as they heard and told how some had been shot down in defence of their homes; how others had laid down their lives on the scaffold, and others again had fallen victims to disease in the camp at Coblenz, or had perished of want in the garrets of Somers Town. Two of Mazenod's cousins, and many of his father's friends had fallen in the terrible insurrection at Lyons. The splendid ancestral mansion of his family had passed out of their hands. The church in which he had been baptized had been razed to the ground.

For some time Eugene seems to have been undecided as to what career he should enter. The army, which then offered so splendid an opening for a young man, had no attraction for him. To serve the usurper in a civil capacity would be an act of treason to the rightful sovereign. He did not, however, waste his time. Every day he devoted many hours to his favourite studies—literature, history, philosophy, and theology; and thus acquired those vast stores of learning which afterwards stood him in good stead in the busy years of his missionary and episcopal life. The various branches of “lay help,” so energetically taken up at all times by young French gentlemen, found in him an enthusiastic worker. There is a portrait of him at this time which shows him to have been an almost perfect type of manly beauty. He was tall and well made, and carried himself with a quiet dignity which recalled the manners of the old *régime*. His lofty forehead and bright beaming eye spoke of intelligence of a high order, while his aquiline nose and fully developed jaw revealed a determination and a power which would have repelled but for the sweet expression about the mouth and the clear unclouded brow. We are not surprised to learn that when he visited Paris, in 1805, he was earnestly solicited to enter Napoleon's service. His father's old friend, Portalis, now high in the Emperor's favour, endeavoured to persuade him that all hope of a restoration was at an end, and that it was mistaken loyalty to refuse to work for his country's good; he assured him that a sub-prefecture awaited him, and that as soon as he became familiar with official duties he would be promoted



to be prefect. Even the Papal Legate, Caprara, added his efforts to overcome his objections. But all to no purpose. Eugene returned to Aix to resume his studies and good works.

At length, in 1808, when he was already twenty-six years old, he announced to his mother that the moment had come for him to carry out his early resolve to devote himself entirely to the service of God in the priesthood. Once more he journeyed to Paris, and entered St. Sulpice, which had been re-opened by M. Emery. Never, perhaps, was there a time when that famous seminary contained so many students who were destined to occupy great posts in the Church of France. Their names are better known in their own country than in ours; but the fame of De Quelen, Archbishop of Paris, and of Affre, his martyred successor, belongs to the world. Even among such companions, Mazenod speedily excelled. His well-trained mind, his ripe age, his character, formed by the vicissitudes of his early years, all gave him advantages which the others did not possess. In a little more than a year after his entry, he received the subdiaconate, and six months later the diaconate. But his course was destined to be rudely disturbed. Napoleon, now at the height of his glory, had entered on his unhappy contest with the Holy See. The Pope had been seized in the Quirinal, and had been hurried away a prisoner to Savona. The cardinals were forced to take up their abode in Paris. Thirteen of them refused to submit to the tyrant's will. Many of the clergy, and especially the Sulpicians, protested loudly against the imprisonment of the saintly Pius VII. The Emperor was not the man to tolerate any opposition to his plans. On the evening of June 16th, 1810, an order reached St. Sulpice depriving M. Emery of his office. Mazenod was deputed by his fellow-students to convey to the venerable superior the expression of their sympathy. He, too, had the melancholy satisfaction of attending him in his last illness, and of receiving his dying blessing. At the abortive National Council of Paris the young abbé was one of the masters of ceremonies, and in this capacity his familiarity with Italian was of great service to the many

prelates who had been summoned from across the Alps. The great question to solve which the council had been convoked, touched him closely. Cardinal Maury, forgetful of his glorious services to the Church in the early years of the Revolution, had taken upon himself the administration of the diocese of Paris without canonical institution, and, indeed, in defiance of the Pope's prohibition.<sup>1</sup> In the ordinary course of events Mazenod would have presented himself for ordination at Notre Dame. But to take orders from an intruded prelate was an infamy to which he could not stoop. The bold conduct of the Sulpicians, during and after the council, excited Napoleon to still greater fury against them. On October 8th, 1811, he gave orders for their expulsion from the seminary, and for the total suppression of their institute. Once again it fell to the Abbé De Mazenod to undertake the perilous duty of protesting on behalf of his fellow-students against this fresh act of tyranny. The old professors were replaced by such of the seminarists as were sufficiently advanced to occupy the vacated posts. Mazenod, although only in deacon's orders, was appointed to the chair of liturgy, and became one of the directors of the seminary. His difficulty about receiving the priesthood was now overcome by the advice of an old Provencal friend, Mgr. De Demandolx; and on December 21st, 1811, at Arles, that prelate's cathedral city, his heart's desire was granted to him. I wish I had space to transcribe the touching language in which he expresses what he felt on receiving the sublime office of the ministry; but here I must be content with the story of the outward events in which he took part, leaving it to his own religious children to reveal to us his inner life.

Rejecting a pressing invitation from the bishop to accept the office of vicar-general, he returned to St. Sulpice. Although the youngest priest among the directors, he at once became the favourite confessor of the seminarists. But he soon found that his work lay among the neglected poor of his dear Provence. When the summer vacation

<sup>1</sup> See "Cardinal Maury," *I. E. RECORD*, December, 1892, p. 1078.

arrived, he resigned his professorship and left for home. His friends now expected that one so accomplished would occupy some prominent pulpit in Aix, and would delight the brilliant world of fashion and letters by the eloquence and learning of his discourses. To their surprise, it was announced in the beginning of the following Lent, that the Abbé De Mazenod would preach in Provençal to the poor every Sunday morning at six o'clock. It was thus that he endeavoured to walk in the footsteps of his Master. "He came to Nazareth, where He was brought up, and He went into the synagogue, as His custom was on the Sabbath day, and He rose up to read . . . and He found the place where it was written : The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, wherefore He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor."<sup>1</sup> And he remembered, too, how when the Baptist had sent from his dungeon to our Lord to ask if He was the Messiah, the answer had been that the poor had the gospel preached to them.<sup>2</sup> He was convinced that the only way to reach his humbler fellow-citizens was to speak to them in their own familiar tongue. The early hour appointed for the sermons was intended to benefit the servants and working men, but numbers of the better class thronged to hear him. The experiment proved an enormous success. Mazenod's joy was unbounded. His vocation was decided. Henceforth his whole energy was to be given up to the service of the poor. His style of oratory was indeed admirably adapted for what are known as mission sermons. He was possessed of a powerful, sonorous, and sympathetic voice, and an animated delivery. The charm of his outward appearance, so important a factor in oratory, has already been described. His discourses themselves were remarkable for their clearness and precision, but were entirely without the coldness which often accompany these qualities. None of them were ever written out. The preacher spoke from the fulness of his heart, and from the fulness of his well-stored and well-trained mind. He is but one

<sup>1</sup> Luke iv. 16-18.

<sup>2</sup> The motto of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate is : *Evangelizare pauperibus misit me : Pauperes evangelizantur.*

more instance of the beneficial effect of remote preparation by careful and prolonged study of the masterpieces of literature. Such capable and even prejudiced authorities as Thiers and Mignet, pronounced him a really great orator.

The fervent missionary saw at once that the work of re-evangelizing Provence could not be accomplished single-handed. He began, therefore, to project a congregation of priests, bound together by rules drawn from the statutes of St. Ignatius, St. Charles, St. Philip Neri, and later founders. There were at the time many zealous young abbés already engaged in labours similar to his own. A number of these readily consented to join in his scheme. A building, which had been a Carmelite convent in the days before the Revolution, was purchased, and here in the beginning of the year 1816, the Abbé De Mazenod and his first companion, the Abbé Tempier, took up their abode. A few weeks later, three others joined. The little community naturally chose their founder as the first superior of the association of *Missionaries of Provence*. They lost no time in setting to work. Grans, a place where the faith had become well-nigh extinct, was the scene of their first mission. The parish church, which was on the point of being closed for want of worshippers, was crowded at every service. Four priests hearing confessions, without a break in the twenty-four hours, could not get through the crowds of penitents. Yet there were not wanting devout persons who took exception to the methods employed by the missionaries. Most of these are familiar enough to us now; but they still continue to excite disapproval and even ridicule in some quarters. The two characteristics of the missions were the dramatic element introduced into the services, and the house-to-house visitation. The latter was not open to much objection, though it was in many instances a painful task for those who had to carry it out. It was the novel style of the services which was especially singled out for attack. Mazenod knew well that he had to deal with a highly imaginative and emotional people. What more natural than to appeal to their senses and to their feelings? Hence he



laid great stress on the ceremonious reception of the fathers, on all the impressive details of the penitential processions through the streets of the parish, the solemn proclamation of the Decalogue, the renewal of baptismal vows, the consecration of the children, and afterwards of the whole of the inhabitants to the Blessed Virgin, and especially the public planting of the Cross as a standing memorial of the triumphs of the mission.

Everywhere in the diocese of Aix the labours of the missionaries were crowned with conspicuous success. Soon the neighbouring bishops wished to secure their services. But now that the little society was about to travel beyond the limits of the diocese, it became necessary for the members to constitute themselves into a regular religious congregation. After some little demur on the part of certain of their number, they assembled at Aix on the feast of All Saints, 1818, and there they bound themselves by vow as members of the religious institute of missionaries of Provence.

For some time F. De Mazenod had been working to bring about the re-establishment of the bishopric of Marseilles and the nomination thereto of his uncle, the Abbé Fortuné De Mazenod, who had in the old days been Vicar-General of Aix. This venerable ecclesiastic had persistently refused all the revolutionary oaths, and had, with great difficulty, escaped from France in 1797. He still remained in exile long after his nephew and his sister-in-law had returned home. In 1817 F. De Mazenod prevailed on the government to grant both his requests. The Abbé Fortune arrived in Marseilles after his long absence, but only to find that the decree of re-establishment had been cancelled. Though for the time his plans were thwarted, Father De Mazenod still persevered. The striking success of the missions at Marseilles, in 1820, caused a renewal of the overtures for the re-establishment of the see. His opponents, as a last resource, represented to the government that the Abbé Fortuné was more than seventy years old, and therefore unable to fulfil all the duties of a bishop. Mgr. De Frayssinous, the king's almoner, after meeting the

Abbe and finding him quite a vigorous man, overruled this objection : and at length, in the opening of 1823, the decree was issued. At the same time it was proposed to nominate the founder of the missionaries to the see of Chalons-sur-Marne : but the bishop-elect begged that his nephew might be left to assist him in the re-organization of the new diocese. Accordingly, Eugene was appointed provost and vicar-general. In those capacities he became the virtual ecclesiastical ruler of Marseilles. Some of the clergy, as might be expected, demurred to what they considered his high-handed proceedings. " Prince Eugene " was the nickname by which he became known. But at certain periods, especially in beginnings, an enlightened despotism is the best form of government. Hence his critics afterwards came to acknowledge that his administration was just and wise. Later on we shall have occasion to speak of it at length. One of his acts, at least, has proved a conspicuous success. The seminary of the diocese was confided to the management of his congregation, and in their hands it continued for nearly fifty years to train up a body of clergy second to none in the whole of France.

The missionaries of Provence had now obtained a firm footing and a powerful protector. Still there was the old difficulty about the spread of the congregation beyond the limits of the diocese. And soon there came internal dissensions, which led to the retirement of some of the most trusted members. The Archbishop of Aix, too, went so far as to declare their vows null and void. There was only one way to cope with these troubles, and that was to have recourse to Rome to ask for formal approbation. Father De Mazenod knew well the obstacles which stood in the way of such an extraordinary favour. Urged on by his little community, and armed with a letter of recommendation from all the bishops of Provence, he set out for the Eternal City, in November, 1825. On his arrival, he was received with great cordiality by the cardinals and other high personages to whom he had introductions. One and all, however, as soon as they learned his errand, assured him that he would fail. Leo XII., who was Pope at the time, had heard of his

labours in Provence, and had expressed a desire to see him. When, however, he heard the request for approbation, he shook his head, and pointed out with the greatest kindness that the utmost he could do was to praise the new institute, without giving any formal approval. His petitioner most respectfully and most earnestly implored him not to stop short of the full approbation. Leo was so touched with his manner, that he consented to allow the case to be brought before the usual tribunal, at the same time warning him that the result would only be a brief of eulogy. He warmly gave the institute his blessing, and allowed them to bear the name of Oblates of Mary Immaculate.<sup>1</sup> Meantime the anxious missionaries had been pouring forth their most fervent prayers for the success of their founder's petition. They had shared in all the vicissitudes of hope and discouragement through which he had passed. At length, to their great joy, there came a letter bearing date February 18th, 1826.

"*Te Deum laudamus* [it began], *Te Dominum confitemur* . . . Yesterday evening the Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XII., confirmed the decision of the cardinals, and specifically approved of the Institute, Rules, and Constitution of the Oblate Missionaries of the most Holy and Immaculate Virgin Mary. He accompanied this solemn act of pontifical power by the most flattering expressions to those who have the happiness of belonging to this Society, from which the Head of the Church expects the greatest good."

Meantime the new municipality of Marseilles had decreed that at the death of the bishop the see should cease to exist. Mgr. De Mazenod, now in his eighty-fourth year, took immediate steps to defeat their designs. At his earnest request to the Pope, his nephew was appointed Bishop of Icosia *in partibus infidelium*, with a view to succeed him in Marseilles. The consecration took place in Rome, October 14th, 1832. On his return home, the new prelate was at once entrusted with the practical management of the diocese. His visitation of the various parishes resembled his early

<sup>1</sup> When the missionaries travelled beyond Provence, their original title lost its meaning. They, therefore, changed it to Oblates of St. Charles; but, finding this designation already borne by another institute, they finally adopted the name of Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

missions. Not content with performing the routine duties of his office, he made his visit the occasion for rekindling the fervour of the people, and bringing them to the sacraments. But these labours were cut short by a mysterious order from Propaganda to report himself in Rome. When he arrived there he was ordered away to Tunis! With the utmost respect for the authorities he insisted on knowing the reasons for this banishment. To his astonishment he found that, at the instigation of M. Thiers, the French Government had complained that he had been consecrated without its permission. It was some time before the bishop could bring himself to express any sort of regret for his conduct. When at length he wrote to the King, his position was recognised, and he was summoned to Paris to take the usual oath at the Tuileries. He was received with the warmest cordiality by both Louis Philippe and Marie Amelie. The occasion, indeed, was a triumph for the Orleanist cause, as the bishop soon found to his cost. Many of his old friends fell away from him, and the legitimist families in Marseilles refused to call on him. No wonder that he sometimes regretted the step that he had taken.

The old bishop now resolved, by a bold stroke, to circumvent the machinations of his opponents. He wrote direct to the King, and offered his resignation of the diocese, on condition that Mgr. Eugene should be appointed in his place. This was in December, 1836. Four months passed away without any reply being received. He began to think that his offer had been rejected, when to his great joy there came on April 7th, 1837, an official letter announcing that his resignation had been accepted, and that his nephew had been appointed to succeed him. All through his uncle's episcopate Mgr. Eugene had been the real governor of the diocese. The change of bishops, therefore, made very little difference, except that it gave him additional strength in dealing with those who had resented his authority. One who knew him well thus describes his mode of life during his episcopate:

“Mgr. De Mazenod was the very type of a *grand seigneur*. No one officiated as he did: his fine figure, his beautiful voice, his



handsome face, his noble bearing, gave incomparable majesty to all his actions. On high days he dressed superbly, he drove out in a magnificent carriage, he maintained his rank admirably, and commanded respect. In a drawing-room he was the perfect gentleman; in private life he was the religious—humble, modest, and poor. His ordinary conveyance was hardly presentable. He gave up the splendid apartments on the first floor of his palace, and resided very poorly on the ground floor. . . . The meanest of all the rooms was his bed-room. The walls were covered with an old blue paper; the bed had no mattress; he slept on straw. . . . His clothes, except on reception days, were old, and in his country-house he wore an old straw hat."

Mgr. De Mazenod's episcopate was fruitful in every kind of good work. His first care was to repair the ravages of the Revolution. All the convents of women were restored; a number of orphanages were constructed and carried on with marked success. He and his uncle established ten parishes in the city, and at least a dozen in the suburbs. Many millions of francs were spent on churches, monasteries, and charitable institutions. The Jesuits and some other religious orders were introduced. He used to say himself that there were in the Church two things which always struck him more than anything else, and proved to him convincingly the presence and action of the Holy Ghost—the devotedness of the missionaries, and the penitent life of the cloistered nuns. The Poor Clares, Carmelites, Capuchins, and other similar orders of religious women were the consolation of his episcopate.

Even after his nomination to the diocese of Marseilles, Mgr. De Mazenod continued to be the Superior of the Oblates, and to share in all their successes and persecutions. The new Bishop of Gap went so far as to withdraw faculties from all the Oblates in his diocese. This measure was a severe blow to the missionaries, as it involved the loss of their house at Laus, the cradle of their little society. On the other hand, Mgr. Bourget, Bishop of Montreal, was at this time in France anxiously looking out for priests to minister to the spiritual wants of his vast diocese. As soon as he heard of the Oblates, he begged Mgr. De Mazenod to be good enough to send him at least four of his fathers. Naturally enough the founder hesitated to put such a test

to their obedience and zeal. Hitherto their sphere of action had been confined to the immediate neighbourhood of their own diocese. He, therefore, laid the proposal before each of them, and from every one there came the answer: "Lo, here am I, send me." (Isaias vi. 8.) The first missionaries for Canada set out on September 28th, 1841. This mission has been singularly blessed. There are now in North America two complete provinces of the Order, one for Canada and one for the United States. Moreover, one entire ecclesiastical province—that of St. Boniface—containing five dioceses, has been entrusted to the exclusive charge of the Oblates.

There was another country nearer home where the harvest was great and the labourers few. Here in England the Oxford movement was beginning to produce its first converts, while the fast-growing numbers of Irish immigrants proved too heavy a burden for the existing clergy. There was already among the Oblates one Irish priest bearing the familiar name of Father Daly. At the earnest request of Father Young, a zealous missionary in Cornwall, he was permitted, in 1841, to pass over into England to spread the faith in that spiritually-benighted country. Later on, parishes, or rather missionary districts, were assigned to the Oblates in Liverpool, Leeds, London, and Birkenhead. In Ireland, too, they soon found a home, and there they have established at Stillorgan, near Dublin, the novitiate for these countries. Mgr. De Mazenod came over to England himself to visit the mission established in Liverpool. What happened on this occasion must be described in his own words:—

"Our fathers have charge of the district of Holy Cross, inhabited by a multitude of poor Irish. It would take too long to tell all that is done in the miserable shed which serves for a chapel, and is filled six times every Sunday; but I cannot pass over in silence the scene which took place in the evening after the Benediction. The crowd which filled the chapel and the galleries was waiting for me in the passage; they rushed at me to kiss my hands, my clothes, and even my feet. They were moved by their admirable faith, their enthusiasm, their respect and affection. It took me half an hour to make my way through the little gathering,

for each one wanted to touch me, and to receive my blessing. When they caught hold of my hands they put them on their heads. My rochet was not the better for this, but my heart was stirred at the sight of such a spectacle. When at last I got as far as the foot of the staircase leading to the street, I found a still larger crowd collected there, and now nothing could restrain their enthusiasm. The thousands of Catholics kept on cheering with all their might. But this was not enough. Multitudes went on before, surrounded me, and followed me to the house of our Fathers, pushing aside anyone that was in the way, and so excited with joy that all the townspeople were astonished, and the neighbours rushed to the windows and the doors. When I reached the house, I turned round at the threshold to bow my acknowledgments to the crowd. Once more the cheering began, and was repeated again and again with fresh transports of enthusiasm."

The mission of Ceylon was founded in 1847, and has so flourished that to-day the Archbishop of Colombo and the Bishop of Jaffna are both members of the Order. South Africa was not behindhand in asking for missionaries. There, too, they have laboured with eminent success, and now the vicariates of Natal and Orange Free State are in the charge of Oblate bishops. Truly the finger of God is here.

Want of space prevents me from doing anything like justice to Mgr. De Mazenod's career during the latter years of Louis Philippe's reign, during the Second Republic, and during the first half of the Second Empire. All through this trying time he worthily upheld the dignity of the episcopate, utterly refusing to consider himself as a State functionary, and successfully resisting the persistent interference of the government officials. He was on terms of great intimacy with Napoleon III., who often had occasion to visit Marseilles. In 1857 the bishop was appointed senator. This favour, however, did not prevent him from strenuously opposing the war in Italy. In short, he proved himself a model to all his episcopal brethren in their dealings with the State. As for his relations with the Holy See, it need hardly be said that they were most cordial. The definition of the Immaculate Conception was naturally a great joy to one who had dedicated his missionary society to

that privilege of Our Lady. Although only a bishop he had already received for himself and his successors the right to the pallium. A yet higher dignity was in store for him had he survived a few months longer. At the Emperor's request, Pius IX. readily consented to grant him a cardinal's hat; but the preconisation was reserved owing to the troubled condition of Rome. Before peace was restored, Mgr. De Mazenod had gone to his reward (May 21st, 1861).

T. B. SCANNELL.

---

## "HORÆ LITURGICÆ:" OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL.

### SOME MASSES IN THE "PROPRIUM DE TEMPORE."

#### III.

##### LOW SUNDAY.

**D**OMINICA in albis (depositis)," so called, for on this day the newly-baptized, who had been wearing their white robes since Easter Eve, appeared now at the sacred offices in their usual dress. Holy Church takes occasion in her maternal solicitude to warn them that, though they have put aside the outward dress of innocence, they must be careful to preserve unstained the purity of their soul and keep ever burning the light of faith; for it is through faith alone that victory is to be gained. The station to-day is appropriately at the Church of St. Pancras, that heroic boy who, despite of his tender years, obtained the victory and the martyr's palm through his faith.

The Introit is from the Epistle of the first Pope (1 St. Peter ii.), whose faith, according to our Lord's own words, was never to fail, so that he might confirm his brethren. "As babes newly born, alleluia, desire ye without guile the milk that is according to reason." "Exult in God our helper; be ye glad in the God of Jacob" (Ps. lxxx.). Compare St. Peter's words with those of his fellow-apostle (1 Cor. iii.): "As to little ones in Christ, I gave you milk to



drink;" and these other words: "and ye are become such as have need of milk . . . for every one that is a partaker of milk is unskilful in the word of justice, for he is a little child" (Heb. v. 12-13). We see thereby that Holy Church looks upon her newly-baptized children as infants in grace, and needing still a watchful eye and a loving care. This thought runs through all the Masses of this time, for she is desirous of giving "the rational milk" to feed her children; that is, the milk which is fitting for them in their new life. Here we get a lesson as to our behaviour towards converts to the Church. Our duty towards them is not over when they have been received into the fold and made their first communion. They are as little children in the faith, and need a great deal of patient care and nourishment, so that they may grow up to the full measure of "the man in Christ." In the verse of the Psalm we have a reference to the "God of Jacob." Why is this? The whole of this psalm (lxxx.) is one of those hymns that were sung during the Paschal solemnities, and refers to the deliverance of "the house of Jacob from the barbarous people" (Ps. cxiii.); and this is an image of the deliverance of the new Christians from the power of Satan, who has been supplanted by Jesus, the true Jacob, Who has obtained on our behalf, while clothed in the garments of our humanity, the blessing of the Father.

The Collect bids adieu to the Paschal feast, and prays that we may preserve the spirit of the resurrection in our life and actions. In the Epistle (1 St. John v.) we are instructed in the virtue of faith, which the beloved disciple tells us is our victory, for it is born of God, and, therefore, conquers the world. The great object of faith is Jesus Christ. "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved" (Acts xvi. 31); and St. John brings forward as witnesses for our faith the testimony of earth and, what is far greater, the testimony of God. The Father, the Son Himself, and the Spirit bear testimony that the Christ is the Son of God, and the very Truth; and on earth there is the witness of the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these, like the former witnesses, are one. The double witness of the Spirit is to be remarked; for not only is there the external witness of

the Holy Ghost descending upon the Christ at the baptism, and the visible manifestation of His temporal mission in Holy Church, but there is also the internal witness of the Divine Spirit in our conscience, bearing testimony that we are the sons of God, and have this sonship through Christ our Elder Brother Who makes us co-heirs with Him and God. The Gradual contains the angel's promise to the holy women; but it is now put into our Lord's own mouth, for He it was whose word the angel spoke. It is followed by an account of to-day's mystery and our Lord's gracious greeting to His disciples.

The Gospel (St. John xxi.) gives the history of our Lord's appearance on Easter Sunday to the Apostles, when He gave them His peace, and they were filled with abundant consolation and rejoiced having seen the Lord. "The peace of the Lord is beyond understanding," and we can only sound its depths by some of its outward manifestations. Our Lord's peace is the result of warfare and of conquering. It is not the peace of the idle and careless, but the peace which comes to the toiler who has finished his work; to the husbandman who rejoices in the rich harvest his care has won. Twice does the Lord give them His peace; and on the second occasion it is to give them their mission and the Holy Ghost for the forgiveness of the sins of mankind. On the very day of His resurrection He hastens to give to His Church the first-fruits of His victory as the pledge of all His other gifts. We may note what the Apostles said to St. Thomas: "We have seen the Lord;" nothing more was needed to express their glory and happiness. The sight of the Face of Jesus is more than recompense for every sorrow and every trial. Our Lord's words were fulfilled: "These things have I spoken unto you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be made full" (St. John vi. 11). Eight days afterwards, that is to say on this Octave Day of Easter, again came in Jesus to His Apostles, "the doors being shut," and gave them once more His peace. We may note here that, if we would enjoy the visitations of our Lord, we must shut the doors of our heart against our enemies, and as St. Bernard says, "Retra-

apart from world, business free." Graciously did He call the doubting Thomas to Him; and yielded to the test the Apostle had demanded; and then gently did He chide Him for his want of belief: "Put in thy *finger* thither," as though to point out what sin had done; "put in thy *hand* into My side," as though to grasp the treasures of the Sacred Heart pierced for us. These things are written that we, like St. Thomas, may have faith in Him as the Christ, the Son of God, and worship Him, as the Apostle did, as our "Lord and God." The Offertory reminds us that Him in whom we believe, "God raised up the third day, and gave Him to be manifest," even as the angel declared to the holy women. In the Secret holy Church prays with great exultation that her gifts may be received, and that she who is filled with joy so great may obtain the fruit of never-ending bliss. Our Divine Master's words to St. Thomas are, in the Communion, addressed to ourselves, and He speaks from within our heart. He bids us look on the place of the nails, and be not unbelieving, unfaithful; for if at any time we can recognise Him it is surely "in the breaking of bread" when our heart is burning within us. The Post-Communion reminds us that the Sacred Mysteries are the source of our spiritual resurrection now at this time, and, as the Church sings in the words of the Angelical, are also the *pignus futurae glorie* even as the Master hath spoken: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood . . . I will raise him up at the last day" (St. John vi.).

#### THE ASCENSION OF THE LORD.

The forty days our Lord passed on earth in opening the understanding of the Apostles, that they might understand the Scriptures (St. Luke xx. 10), and in speaking to them of the Kingdom of God (Acts i.), were now at an end. The "Man" who had gone forth in the morning of life to His labour of our redemption, now, as the even-tide of the appointed time had come, was about to return home to His rest (Ps. ciii. 24). The work His Father had given Him was fully accomplished; the wall of separation was broken down,

and the human race had been reconciled in the blood of the Spotless Lamb. He had provided for the carrying on of His work by means of the Church He had founded and gifted with heavenly powers, and He had made all things ready for the coming of the other Comforter, who was ever to abide with and quicken His Body mystical. It was expedient for us that our Good Master should take away His visible presence from us and go to prepare a place for us, that we may be where He our Lord and Elder Brother is; that is, for ever in the home of His God and our God, His Father and our Father.

The Introit (Acts i.) bursts forth with the angels' words to the "men of Galilee" who were gazing with yearning looks of rapture after their ascending Lord: as He went so will He return at the last day "in great power and majesty." In the Psalm (xlv.) Holy Church calls on all nations to rejoice with her in the triumph of Him who, ascending on high, has made them that were heretofore captives to sin now become captives to that Love which has bought them with a price, even His most precious blood. All nations are called upon to rejoice; for Holy Church has received the whole earth as her inheritance, and God wills that all should be brought to the knowledge of the truth. This Psalm was sung when the Ark of the Covenant was taken to Mount Sion, and so is peculiarly appropriate to this day, when the true Ark of the Covenant, Jesus, "in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9.), is taken up to the Mount of God. We shall find several references to this Psalm during the Mass. In the Collect we pray that our hearts may be even fixed in that place which our Lord has gone to prepare for us. The Lesson is St. Luke's account of the events of this day. The inspired writer seems to imply that our Lord was assumed by the power of the Holy Ghost; and we can see a fitting reason for this; for as in the first place the Incarnation was wrought in Mary's womb by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, so the final triumph should be consummated by the power of that same Holy Spirit, "the finger of God's right hand," where our Lord is ever seated in majesty. The Apostles were still hankering after the material



prosperity which they had always been taught to associate with the Messiah, and they asked when the kingdom should be restored to Israel. Our Divine Lord again opens their understanding, and tells them that the Holy Ghost shall come to them, and that they shall be made witnesses to their Master; not to the local Israel only, but to what is the true Israel of God, the whole race of Adam; for, by the Atonement, "He had enlarged the boundaries of His nation," and now all were called, "from the east and the west," to share in His Kingdom. The Gradual resumes the triumphant song of the Psalm used in the Introit, and speaks, under the figure of the Jews, of the jubilations of the heavenly citizens coming forth to meet their King, and leading him back in triumph to sit at the right hand of the Father. To this is joined an extract from Psalm lxxvii., upon which words St. Paul comments in his Epistle to the Ephesians (x.).

The Gospel is St. Mark's last words; and in it we read the mission of the Apostles, the promise of the Divine assistance the Ascension of our Lord, and the Apostles' faithful fulfilment of their Master's commission. From the sunny heights of Olivet, by Bethany, it came to pass that the sacrifice of the Victim was visibly accepted by the Eternal Father; for, as in the sacrifices of old the flame leapt up towards heaven in token of the Divine acceptance, so did He, our Peace-offering ascend "whilst blessing them, and departed from them, and was carried up into heaven (St. Luke xxiv.). St. Luke gives us a few more details in his Gospel. We learn that the Apostles "adoring, went back to Jerusalem with great joy." They knew full well, even as we do, that while it was sad to part with the visible presence of the Beloved, yet that He had found a means of keeping His gracious promise of remaining with us until the end of the world; so joy filled their hearts. The "little while" had come when they were to lose sight of His human Face, yet He was going to multiply His presence all over the world in the great Sacrament of His love. Where then could there be room for sorrow when He who had "departed" was still with them, and with them in a way more close and intimate than any natural presence ever could have been? We can see an image of this in the

extinction of the Paschal candle. Although the forty days of the Risen Life are at an end, yet their effects must never end in our soul; and it is more expedient for us to abide yet awhile in the "kindly light" of divine faith than in the full glare of vision; for it is by faith that we "conquer kingdoms" and become pleasing to God.

The Offertory repeats the prophecy of the Psalmist from Psalm xlvii., about the Ascension; it seems as though Mother Church, in her exulting joy, would repeat these glad words over and over again in order to express her delight and jubilee at the triumph of her Spouse; and the Secret reminds us that the gifts are to-day offered in memory of the glorious Ascension, and contains a prayer that by them we may merit to reach life eternal. The Communion (Ps. lxxvii.) bids us praise Him who ascends above the heavens, even to the *Orient*; that is, to the very Fount of Light, the great white Throne whereon sits, in light inaccessible to creatures, the Ancient of Days. And yet, oh! wonder, He who is thus enthroned in glory, is enthroned now in our poor hearts! In the Post-Communion we pray that the visible gifts we have offered may work in us their invisible effect; and towards this end we remind God that He is the Omnipotent and Merciful.

#### PENTECOST.

This day, the fiftieth after the Pasch, the Jews kept as a double festival. They celebrated the promulgation of the Law on Sinai, which took place on the fiftieth day after the Israelites had gone out of the land of Egypt—see St. Augustine, Epist. cix., and also the offering of the first-fruits of the still young harvest. It was therefore fitting that on this day also, "when the days of Pentecost were accomplished," that the New Law, which was to make perfect the Old, should be promulgated, and that the Church newly born should begin its loving work for the salvation of souls, and at Peter's word gather in the first-fruits of the Gospel preaching. On Sinai the law was given by the hands of an angel to one man, Moses, but in the upper room the New Law was given by the Holy Ghost to the Body mystical of Christ, to

Peter and the other Apostles who were persevering in prayer with Her who was the Mother of Him whose promise they awaited. Not on tablets of stone is the new law written, but "on the fleshy tablets of our hearts" (2 Cor. iii. 3); for we know, and the Holy Ghost Himself giveth testimony, that we *are* the sons of God; as He foretold by Jeremias: "I will write My law on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people" (xxxi. 33). Holy Church in the Mass for to-day, and indeed in the Masses during the octave, sets before us the wonderful effects the Holy Ghost produces in the world and in our souls by His temporal mission. In the Introit (Wisdom i. 7) we learn that the Divine Spirit, being God, embraces and fills all things, and has knowledge of every voice; that is, of every thought and motion of our heart. "Let God arise, and His enemies be scattered," for He is a consuming fire, and tries every man's works. In the Collect the Church prays God that, as on this day He did deign to enlighten with the fire of the Holy Ghost the hearts of the Apostles, who thus became "His faithful," so may we, aided by the same gracious Spirit know the things that are right, and be made glad with divine comforts. The Lesson is St. Luke's account of the wonder of this day. The gift of tongues bestowed upon the Apostles undid the work of the confusion of Babel, for now in place of confusion was to be divine order and unity, and mankind was to be reunited into one family with Jesus and Mary as the second Adam and Eve. How generously our good Master helped the Apostles to fulfil His order to "go and teach *all* nations." He is indeed ever ready and faithful to help us to fulfil the duty He lays upon us. We may remark on the testimony "of the religious men from every nation" that the Apostles used their new powers and gifts to tell of the wonderful things of God, even as the first recorded words of our ever-blessed and dear Lady after the Incarnation were to recount "the great things" God had done to her. The Gradual (Ps. ciii.) is a prayer to the "Creator Spirit," who moved over the face of the waters and brought this world "so good" out of its primeval chaos, to come into our hearts, and to renew

the work of grace which we have spoilt through sin; to make again of this earth, which was once so good and fair in His adorable eyes, a paradise of pleasure where He may walk with Adam's children "in the cool of even-tide;" that is, in the inner and secret recesses of the soul far away from the noonday glare of this worldly life. In the Sequence what a depth of tenderness and love and gentleness is revealed. The Holy Ghost is "the poor man's Father," "the Giver of the sevenfold gifts," "the Light of hearts," "the best of all Consolers," "the sweet Guest of souls," "our pleasant Rest amid toil, our Shelter in distress of heat, and our Solace when in tears." He is the cause of the merit of all our virtues; He brings to a successful issue the work of our salvation, and gives us the unfading joys of heaven. The Sequence is a comment on St. Paul's teaching that we cannot even say the Holy Name so as to profit us without the assistance of the Holy Ghost, to Whom is appropriated the work of sanctification.

In the Gospel (St. John xiv.) our Divine Master tells us why He was going to send the Holy Ghost; namely, "to teach us all truth." The coming of the "other Comforter" was to be the "peace" which our Lord was leaving with the Apostles; and "where the Spirit is, there is liberty;" and where there is liberty, there is peace, deep and far-reaching. Hence, having true liberty and true peace, our hearts need not be heavy or fearsome. In the Offertory (Ps. lxxvii.) Holy Church prays God to establish in the hearts of her children what the Holy Ghost seeks to work therein. She is become, according to St. Paul, "the temple of the living God," and "kings shall be her nursing fathers;" and the great, "the birds of the air," shall come and dwell beneath her kindly sway. In the Secret we are reminded that one of the effects of the presence of the Holy Ghost within us is so great a light upon the state of our soul, that our conscience is roused to purify all that we see to be unclean and not worthy of the Sacred Presence. The Communion reminds us that what took place in the upper chamber has again taken place in our heart; for, as our Lord says, "If any one love Me. . . . We will come to Him, and make our abode with him." We,



by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, have brought Jesus on to the altar, and have received Him into our heart ; and with Him come the other Blessed Two, and " the whole house " is filled with the presence of God. So let us speak of the great things of God, and show forth His wonders to the world by our changed lives. And as oil poured forth spreads its influence around, so may we, the Church begs in the Post-Communion, by the health-giving and grateful dew of the Holy Ghost, become fruitful in all good works.

#### TRINITY SUNDAY.

Before concluding the cycle of feasts which has been set before us from Advent Holy Church presents to our contemplation the great mysteries of the Adorable Trinity and the Holy Eucharist. In these mysteries is eternal life, according to our Lord's words (St. John xvii. 3), for there is the knowledge of the One True God and of Jesus Christ whom He has sent. In the first, we contemplate the divine Life in heaven together with the unspeakable jubilee of the Godhead ; and, in the second, we look on the sacramental Life of Jesus in this wonderful mystery of faith. The dogma of the Most Holy Trinity is the foundation of all worship and is the cause of all adoration. This mystery is the primeval mystery whence flow all others, and, as it were, draws aside the veil and lets us gaze into the unfathomable depths of the Godhead ; it shows us the Father unbegotten ever begetting the Only Son, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son as from one Principle in ineffable procession. The contemplation of this adorable mystery more than any other abases us to the dust of our own nothingness, spreading a hush of awful worship over our souls, and leaves us prostrate and humble before the Throne. It is this sense of the utter poverty of human wit to celebrate, with any approach to worthiness, this awful mystery that makes the Mass of to-day almost nothing else but a confession of our helplessness to do aught but humbly confess our belief, and acknowledge that all we are and have comes to us from the Blessed Three in One.

The Introit is based on Tobias' prayer (xii.), with additions

by Aleuin, and is a lowly confession that the Triune God hath shown mercy towards us. The Psalm (viii.) brings home to us that this great God whose Name is so wonderful in the whole earth is "*our Lord.*" He is ours on account of the intimate relations we have with each one of the Divine Persons, and because we are members of the Body Mystical of Jesus Christ. These thoughts give a fresh meaning to the Doxology, "*for He hath shown His mercy towards us.*" The Collect is a prayer, based upon our confession of the true faith in the Trinity and Unity of God, for protection against all hurtful things. St. Paul in the Epistle (Rom. xi.) warns us not to search too deeply into the depths of the wisdom of the riches and of the knowledge of God, for His judgments are not to be understood, and His ways no man can search out. He alone can give Himself glory and honour, for He alone is His own perfect praise, and *from Him and through Him and in Him* are all things. This reminds us of the words of the devout author of the *Imitation*: "What will it profit thee to discourse learnedly of the Trinity, if thou art displeasing to the Trinity?" (i. cap.). The Gradual (Dan. iii.) gives us a grand picture of God, blessed and praised for all ages, seated above the Cherubim, and searching out the abysses. This mighty and Eternal God is none other than "*the Lord God of our fathers.*" The Gospel is (St. Matthew xxviii.) our Lord's own solemn enunciation of the mystery and His command to the Apostles to go and teach it to all the nations of the earth, baptizing them "*in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Like the Introit, the Offertory is the laud of the Three Divine Persons, the source of all mercy to us; and the same thought is carried on in the Secret, wherein we pray that the Host we offer may be made to Him an acceptable gift. The Communion is another call to heaven and earth, to all that has life, to bless the Lord of heaven, for now in Holy Communion He has given us a new mark of His mercy; and in the following prayer we ask that the reception of the Holy Sacrament may be as profitable to our body and soul as is our confession of the Trinity in Unity.

## THE SOLEMNITY OF THE BODY OF CHRIST.

The Bull of institution gives us the objects for which this feast is celebrated. They are three in number—(1) to reanimate the faith of Christians in the Real Presence; (2) to make reparation for the outrages offered daily to our Lord in the Most Holy Sacrament; (3) to confound the perfidy of heretics who dare to blaspheme It. Hence comes the spirit of faith, love, and triumph which pervades this most beautiful office.

The Introit (Ps. lxxx.) puts before us at once God's boundless love as prefigured in His dealings with the chosen people in the desert. "He hath fed them with the fatness of wheat," even with the Bread come down from heaven, a type of that true manna, the Body of Jesus Christ; "and hath filled them with honey from the rock." St. Paul tells us, "now the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4); and "the honey from the rock" can be nothing else than that most sweet draught of the Precious Blood which came forth from the five wounds sinners have dug in this sacred Rock; according to the words of David: "They have digged My hands and feet" (Ps. xxi.); and those other words of St. John, "They pierced His side, and forthwith there gushed out blood and water" (xix.). How the strain of joy and triumph runs through the Introit with the sweet cry of Alleluia! It is carried on in the Psalm where the Church calls upon all to rejoice in God our Helper, and to make jubilee to the God of Jacob. The reference to "God our Helper" reminds us of Elias, who received such strength from the bread sent him from heaven, that he was helped "in the strength of that bread" to journey on to the Mount of God; and the "God of Jacob" reminds us how in the days of famine Jacob sent his sons down into the land of Egypt to get bread "lest we die;" and finally went down himself, and thus escaped from want, into the land of plenty.

The Collect reminds us that the Holy Eucharist is the memorial of the Passion of Jesus, "the showing forth of the Lord's death." In the Epistle (1 Cor. xi.) St. Paul tells the Corinthians about the institution of the Blessed Sacrament, and says that he received his knowledge of this

mystery by revelation *a Domino*. In showing forth the death of the Lord we are also showing forth His whole life, for it was that one mighty manifestation of love towards us, and the act of sacrifice included not only His death but every act of His mortal life. And in this Sacrament we have the pledge of His love, for "having loved us He loved us to the end;" and "being a merciful and gracious Lord, He hath given food to them that fear Him" (Ps. cx.). Therefore we must take heed lest we trifle with His love, and despise it by daring to receive the Holy Eucharist unworthily. The Gradual (Ps. cxliv. uses the providence of God in providing for the bodily sustenance of His children as an argument that He who takes heed of the lesser things will not fail to provide food for our souls in fitting season and fill us with every blessing. St. John now lends his voice (vi.), and tells us our Lord's words as to what is that food and blessing. The first is indeed the Flesh and Blood of Jesus, and the other is wrought by our abiding in Him and His abiding in us. Then the great Angelical, who arranged this Mass, bursts forth in words of his own, and sings in glorious verse the wonders of the Mystery of Faith. He calls on the Church to hymn the Saviour, the Leader, and the Shepherd, to the utmost of her power, for to-day a wondrous theme of praise is set before her, none other than the Living and Vital Bread. So let the praise be full and loud, sweet and in harmony with the jubilee of our souls. He then goes on, in words of wonderful clearness and precision, to unfold the mysteries contained in the Blessed Sacrament, and he concludes with that wonderful verse, "Lo! the Bread of Angels made the food of wayfarers: the bread of children indeed, it must not be cast before dogs . . . O Good Shepherd, true Bread, Jesu, have mercy on us. Feed us, guard us, make us see the good things in the land of the living . . . Thou who knowest and canst do all, who here below dost feed us mortals . . . make us there Thy fellow-guests, co-heirs and companions of the holy citizens."

The Gospel is from St. John (vi.), and contains our Lord's teaching on this Sacrament of Faith; and we have His own blessed words to assure us that His Flesh is indeed our food, and His Blood indeed our drink. "This is the



Bread which came down from heaven," the Bread we pray in the *Pater Noster* to be given to us every day. "He that eateth this Bread shall live for ever;" for, as food keeps the body in health and strengthens it against disease, so does the Blessed Sacrament in respect to the soul. More than food, it is also the *medicine* of our souls, and heals the diseases of those who have recourse to this potent cure; for it is the very Author of Life Himself, and is the source within us of all our supernatural life; that is to say, union with Jesus which will know no end as far as He is concerned, but will last, if we break it not, for ever and ever. Hence in the Offertory (Levit. xxi.) we are warned that, if the priest of the Old Law had to be holy to God because of their offering of incense and loaves to the Lord, we who have a much more august offering, even the Divine Victim, "the Bread come down from heaven," and the incense of the prayers and desires of the God-man, are much more bound to take heed lest we lose the holiness our office demands, and pollute His name.

In the Secret we are reminded that the Holy Eucharist is the cause of the unity and peace of the Church, for "we are all one, all who eat of this one Bread (1 Cor. xvii.). We are all one with one another, for we find our point of union in our Divine Head Jesus, who becomes our very own in Holy Communion. The Communion takes a deeper sense now that the mysteries are accomplished, and it is a warning to us to let our good works shine before men, so that they may see thereby the wonderful effects the Lord's death can work in souls. We are also taught to take heed lest we lose our grace and profane the treasure entrusted to us with such a loving confidence by our good Lord. In the Post-Communion the Church prays that the seeds of life eternal implanted in us by the Holy Eucharist may spring forth into everlasting fruit, according to our Lord's words: "He that eateth this Bread shall live for ever." It is impossible to give more than just an outline of some of the thoughts which this Mass suggests. Every sentence, almost every word, teems with food for spiritual reflection, and will repay our long and frequent study.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

## "THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW" ON THE NECESSITY OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

THE anonymous author of the splenetic article on "The Policy of the Pope," which appeared in *The Contemporary Review* of December last, has treated us to another effusion in the same periodical on "The Pope and the Bible." He had "fondly hoped," he said, "to pour abundant oil on troubled waters," and he "deeply regrets" to find that, instead, "*upon tongues of consuming fire*" his soothing unction has vainly flowed. We may observe—(1) that "the troubled waters" are largely due to the rash words and heedless conduct of himself and of "Catholics" who, like himself, think more of their own interests and their own private judgment than of the interests of the Church and the judgment of the Catholic episcopate; and (2) that the composition wherewith he so fondly hoped to calm the surging waves was not oil, but rather sharpest acid. He still maintains the veil of an anonymous good Catholic, and professes that "he ventured respectfully to put forward his views in the interests of *our*<sup>1</sup> Church and in the name of numerous co-religionists." Of course he was bound to offer to the Catholic public some apology for the gross blunders and misrepresentations he had been shown to be guilty of in his first article, by Father Brandi in the *Civiltà*, and Father Morris in the *Tablet*. He had forged and misquoted documents, and shown a malevolent spirit of ignorant discontent against the Holy See. Yet no honest straightforward *amende* is forthcoming, but only this wretched piece of disingenuous vagueness: "I owe it to my readers frankly to acknowledge and sincerely to deplore the circumstance that when dealing with the political events of many years and

<sup>1</sup> The present writer would be grateful to the anonymous gentleman if he would resolve the doubt whether "*Our Church*" stands for the *Uec, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church*, or for a certain schismatic body, now nearly extinct, which fraternised with the Lutherans of Germany, and followed the infallible Dollinger. No one but a disciple of that proud schismatic could have so misrepresented Catholic doctrine regarding the authority of the Pope and the *Ecclesia docens*.

many countries, *the records of which were not at hand at the time of writing*, certain inaccuracies (!) unavoidably crept into my article; and I owe it to the advocates of the Papal policy to express my profound regret that these slips (!) leave each and every one of my contentions as to the final aim and immediate results of the policy of our Holy Father absolutely unweakened and untouched.”

How is it possible that a man calling himself a Catholic, and a loyal son of the Holy See, dare rush—mark, I do not say “venture respectfully,” but rush—headlong into a Protestant magazine, *without the proper documents* before him, in order to begrime and belittle such an important subject as the policy of the Pope! Verily, “fools rush in where angels fear to tread.” Did he not reflect that, at least, there was danger of still further increasing the religious difficulties of the country of which he is a diplomatist—that there was a certainty of giving the Liberals of Austria, France, and Italy an apparent triumph over the Holy See, or a feast of ridicule against our Holy Father? And instead of a direct answer to the grave charges brought against him, he simply assumes a tone of injured innocence—complaining of “tongues of consuming fire”—“much wrath, bitterness, and, I fear, less venial sin.” What a Protean prodigy is this anonymous literary diplomat! He possesses, it seems, enough of the genius of the statesman to measure himself against Leo XIII., who, as even the antipapal press of Italy but lately proclaimed, can scarce find an equal among all the great politicians of the age. He is deeply versed, too, in morals and dogma, and withal such an adept in Scriptural lore, that he is able to stand up before the parliament of English Protestantism as the representative of “our (*i.e.*, *his*) Church and numerous co-religionists,” and to teach learned theologians the limits of Papal interference in the internal policy of nations, the proper relations of Church and State, the prerogatives of the Holy See—in particular her power of dogmatic utterance—the proper method and measure of Biblical criticism; and finally, to determine when his opponents are guilty of that sin which is not *venial*.

Let us take notice of the exceeding delicacy of his

insinuation. He assumes a false, hypocritical mask, that he may seem to kneel as a loyal and devoted son on the steps of the Pontifical throne; and thus he is enabled to aim his abuse and misrepresentation with greater effect, as it were, directly into the face of the Vicar of Christ. When men of honour, in whom the love of truth and honest ways and the sentiment of reverence are not wholly dead, cry shame on his hypocrisy and false dealings, he waxes unctious in the style of Mr. Pecksniff, and writes himself a martyr to uprightness, while those who defend the Papacy against him are guilty of something more than venial sin, because they will not let his cowardly and insidious attack on his "beloved superior" and "father" pass by without an indignant protest. His second paper still further illustrates his dishonesty. He knows how miserably he has failed to substantiate his position regarding the policy of the Pope, and so, like a wary old fox, he runs off on to a new track by confusing the point at issue with the abrupt introduction of a very original excursus on the new criticism: *very original*, I say, save for a few entire pages from certain German critics! Can it be the writer's object to give the public a peep behind the scenes, that we may see how English magazine articles are "got up"?

"Seldom," I wrote in the April number of this periodical, "has the cloak of anonymity been thrown round such a doubtful piece of literary morality as the essay on the policy of Leo XIII. (*Contemporary Review*, October, 1892)." And I now add, that the attempted answer (April, 1893, of the same periodical to Father Brandi's pamphlet, is the most shamefully naked subterfuge, concealed though it be in abundance of stylistic pomp and ornament, that ever a man was ashamed to put his name to. Either this anonymous writer is not a Catholic in the only true sense of the word, *viz.*, a member of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church—and in that case we have to deal with a disgraceful impostor—or he is deliberately misstating, nay falsifying, Catholic teaching and Catholic sentiments and ideas, to tickle the appetite of the No Popery party in England and Ireland, in order to forward certain political ideas.



We cannot suppose that so noble and erudite a writer would be guilty of such crass ignorance of his religion as, for instance—(a) to confound the “Teaching Church” (*Ecclesia docens*) with the small body of theologians which condemned Galileo; and (b) to insinuate that the Jesuits are setting themselves up as a novel organization called “the teaching church” to impose new doctrines on the consciences of the faithful; and (c) to make infallibility consist in a revelation to Pope or Council.”<sup>1</sup> He shall be a “Daniel come to judgment” against himself; for, “at the very moment when his Eminence Cardinal Vaughan announces that he is about to begin his gigantic task of converting thirty millions of Englishmen to our faith,” this anonymous Catholic “sends a pang of despair to the heart of every zealous Catholic;”<sup>2</sup> by his bitter attack on the head of our holy religion;<sup>3</sup> by his wilful misrepresentation of the Pope’s conduct in matters whereon Englishmen are most touchy: by his forging and misquotation of documents, Papal and otherwise: and by his wrong-headed, if not malicious representation of the Church’s teaching. “Tactics of this kind are eminently calculated to render the missionary’s task most difficult, and provoke disheartening replies similar to that made by an uneducated Englishwoman to the priest who endeavoured to induce her to enter our communion.”<sup>4</sup> “I should not object so strongly to the Catholic Church” (as explained and expounded by amateur diplomatic theologians in Protestant magazines), “if it were not for oracular confusion; but

<sup>1</sup> *The Pope and the Bible*, page 457. The “dogma” of the necessity of the temporal power, he says, could not “possibly be the subject-matter of a revelation (!) to Pope or Council”—Döllinger here stands revealed to us! And again: “It was the same ‘teaching Church’ which condemned as false and heretical the proposition of the ‘starry Galileo,’” &c. The dishonesty of the man is apparent. (See also note 2 to page 461, and *passim*.)

<sup>2</sup> Page 458.

<sup>3</sup> He has the hypocrisy, after the way he has spoken of *I eo XIII.*, “his father and beloved superior,” to send up to the heavens of English Protestantism this Pecksniffian whine; “And against whom are these underhand thrusts directed? Against a Catholic and a brother!” (Page 461.)

<sup>4</sup> Why this strange use of “our” throughout this article? Does it include the old Catholic and the Ultramontanes by some sort of analogy?

that goes against the grain of the English people.'<sup>1</sup> "As a Catholic I protest against such methods in the name of thousands,"—aye, and millions—"of my co-religionists."<sup>2</sup>

We have no intention—for it would be vastly unprofitable—to follow our genuine Catholic through all the wild dithyrambic wanderings of his false but ready pen. We will rivet our attention on one single point and on one paragraph, which we beg leave to quote *in extenso*:—"In the course of my article, I repeated an assertion which many eminent members of our communion, like the late Cardinal Newman, had made over and over again in the course of their lives; namely, that no Catholic is bound to believe that it is absolutely indispensable to the weal of Catholicism that his Holiness should be the kinglet of a few thousands of discontented Italians, as well as the Supreme Head of the whole Catholic Church. I might have gone further, and contended that no such proposition could possibly be the subject-matter of revelation to Pope or council; because the imperial power of the Pontiffs having been acquired centuries after the time of the Apostles, there can be no apostolic traditions on which to ground any such dogma. This line of reasoning, I take it, is simple and clear. We refuse to believe in the necessity of the temporal power of the Pope, for reasons which strongly appeal to our intellect, our humanity, and our religious sense. We would willingly waive these considerations, if the contrary proposition were embodied in a dogma obligatory upon all Catholics. This, however, we submit, is out of the question, because the apostolic tradition, which is the indispensable basis of all such dogmas, never existed."

This passage embodies the sum total of the reasons advanced by so-called "liberal" Catholics against the temporal power for centuries—reasons springing from a morbid sentimentalism fed on Protestant ideas and fostered

<sup>1</sup> Page 458.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> This is what some English logicians call a "question-begging epithet." Similar instances of this writer's proficiency in the use of such adjectives are observable *passim*.

in a Protestant atmosphere. Let us examine each position of this oracular proclamation.

I. No Catholic is bound to believe that it is absolutely indispensable to the weal of Catholicism that the Pope should be at once Supreme Head of the whole Church and kinglet.

The equivocation in the anonymous diplomat's phraseology was the common artifice of "liberal" Catholics in the years which marked the first invasion of the Papal States, and was at once detected and exposed by the upholders of the liberty and independence of the Holy See. God, we own, can find any amount of means whereby to rule His Church without the temporal power; no Catholic, no defender of the Civil Principedom, has ever presumed to deny God's omnipotence. Once, however, Divine Providence has made choice of a means for the maintenance of the freedom and authority of the Chair of Peter, and, consequently, of the unity and liberty of Christendom, that means becomes necessary; and, until it shall please Him wholly to abrogate it, and find some substitute for it, no one is allowed to reject it, much less attempt its destruction. Our daily sustenance, according to the present ordinary dispensation of Providence, is bread; but does it follow that bread is absolutely indispensable? It is absolutely indispensable, not to our being (*ad esse*), but to our well-being (*ad bene esse*); unless, indeed, God sees fit to shower down manna from heaven, or to make use of one or other of the infinite modes of His divine power, whereby to sustain mankind.<sup>1</sup> Further, nothing throughout the length and breadth of the universe is "absolutely indispensable," if we look on things in their ultimate reason, which is the Divine goodness participated by creatures according to the Free Will and bounty of their Creator. Supposing, however, the present order of Providence, we proclaim that every Catholic is bound to hold that the temporal sovereignty is indispensable to the Holy See for the full and free exercise of the spiritual supremacy;

<sup>1</sup> See Father Franco, S.J., *Risposte Popolari alle obiezioni più comuni contra la religione*, page 522, &c. (written in 1861).

that it is indispensable, and absolutely indispensable, for the *well-being* of the Holy See: and, therefore, for “the *weal* of Catholicism.” We admit that the Church and her supreme head could exist—for the gates of hell cannot prevail against the Rock;—if reduced to the primitive state of the first century, or of the age of the Catacombs; but will our anonymous author push his principle to its logical conclusion, and join with Gioberti and other such philosophic fathers of the Italian Revolution in desiring such a consummation? We shall see presently that the only alternative is the Catacombs or the Vatican, martyrdom or sovereignty.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, we repeat what has been said authoritatively by Popes and Cardinals and the whole Hierarchy time out of mind, and what has become the general sentiment of the mass of the faithful, viz., that the temporal power of the Holy See is necessary and indispensable, if not for the very existence of the spiritual authority of the Vicar of Christ, at least for its proper and perfect exercise (*non quoad esse sed quoad bene esse*), more especially under the existing circumstances of society.

With these explanations and limitations before our eyes, we argue thus: It has ever been held by all Catholics, and was admitted even by Galileans, that every instruction put forth by the Pope in his capacity of teacher and ruler of the universal Church, and accepted expressly or tacitly by the whole Catholic Episcopate, is necessarily true, and therefore requires the sincere assent of every loyal son of the Church. But the necessity of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope has been thus authoritatively declared by our Chief Pastor, and most expressly accepted as the solemn judgment of the supreme authority in the Church of God. Therefore, we arrive at a conclusion the very contrary of that advanced by our author. The major of this syllogism needs, I think, no demonstration. Let us address ourselves to the proof of the minor.

1. It will be remembered that, in 1859, the Romagna, thanks to *foreign* money and *foreign* rebels, and *foreign* help and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Card. Manning, *Temp. Power of Pope*, page 26.



foreign arms, revolted from the Pope. This event gave occasion to the Encyclical Letter of June 18th, 1859, addressed by Pius IX.—who, by the way, as I may remark for the benefit of the anonymous theological diplomat, was a Pope of *our own times* and not of the middle ages<sup>1</sup>—“to all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries of the various dioceses having grace and communion with the Apostolic See.”<sup>2</sup> The title of this document shows clearly that the Pope was speaking as Supreme Head of the Church universal, and the precision of his language leaves no doubt on the point: “We publicly proclaim (*palam edicimus*) that the civil principedom is necessary to this Holy See, in order that she may exercise her sacred power for the good of religion without any impediment.” He teaches not as a private doctor,<sup>3</sup> but as the Vicar of Christ, and confirmer of His brethren. All hesitation on this head should have been laid to rest by the Encyclical of January 19th, 1860. The bishops of the Catholic world had been roused to express in word and deed their ready acceptance of the Pontiff’s declaration in the Encyclical of the previous June. The sight of this prompt adhesion of the Catholic Hierarchy urged Pius IX. to write in order to encourage and strengthen them in defending and proclaiming the doctrine he had proclaimed.<sup>4</sup> “Vos . . . ipsum principatum constanter tuentes, profiteri et docere gloriati estis, eundem singulari Divinae

<sup>1</sup> On page 160 he writes:—“Father Brandi, in 1893, declares that Pius VII., who died in 1823; Pius IX., who departed this life fourteen years ago; and our present Holy Father, decided that in the *present conjuncture* the temporal power is indispensable to the freedom of the Church.” And he elevates “this dogma” of the Rev. Father Brandi and of “the teaching Church” unto the dignity of an Irish Bull!

<sup>2</sup> I take this important document from the collection of Pontifical documents published as an appendix to Father Steccanella’s book: “Il Valore e la violazione della Dichiarazione Pontificia sopra il Dominio Temporale della Santa Sede.”—(Reprinted from the *Civiltà*, 1864.)

<sup>3</sup> Even were this true, we must remember, with Palmieri (*De Rom., Pontif.*), that “non satis bene dicitur loqui ut *doctor privatus*; licet enim non loquatur ex plenitudine auctoritatis, loquitur tamen *ex auctoritate*: Quocirca R. P. sic loquens non est detrahendus in censum quorumque doctorum privatorum nullam habentium auctoritatem.” Consequently, the Catholic who should scorn his authority could not be held guiltless of all fault.

<sup>4</sup> I quote from the same collection of documents as before, page 416.

illius omnia regentis ac moderantis Providentiæ consilio datum fuisse Romano Pontifici, ut ipse, *nulli civili potestati unquam subjectus*, supremum Apostolici ministerii munus sibi ab ipso Christo Domino divinitus commissum plenissima libertate ac sine ullo impedimento in universum orbem exerceat." He then tells how the sons of the Church—laymen as well as clergy—had sent their express adhesion to the teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff, which had reached them through their bishops,<sup>1</sup> and thus proceeds: "Vos igitur, V. F., qui in sollicitudinis Nostræ partem vocati estis, quique tanta fide, constantia ac virtute ad Religionis, Ecclesiæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis causam propugnandam exarsistis, *pergite* majori animo studioque eandem causam defendere, ac fideles curæ vestræ concreditos quotidie magis *inflammate*, ut sub vestro ductu omnem eorum operam, studia, consilia in Catholicæ Ecclesiæ et hujus Sanctæ Sedis defensione, *atque in tuendo civili ejusdem sedis Principatu*, Beati Petri Patrimonio, *cujus tutela ad omnes Catholicos pertinet*, impendere nunquam desinant." These are, surely, the words of Peter, to whom was committed the high office of confirming his brethren in the truth; and they are words of command: "continue," "incite."

In spite, however, of the gentle Pontiff's strongest judgment, the impious enterprise of the enemies of the Church ceased not; and, with grief in his heart, he was forced to use the awful power of binding placed in his hands by Him whose vicar he was, by proclaiming in the Encyclical of March 26th, 1860, the severest censures of the Church on the violators of his temporal rights and possessions. "Things," he said, "have reached such a pass that we have to make use of that supreme authority which has been granted us by God not only to loosen but to bind; so that due severity may be shown to the guilty, and a salutary example given to others." Now the ground and motive of this sentence was solemnly declared to be the necessity for the Holy See in the present order of things of the possession of a civil principedom in order that the Pope may be free in

<sup>1</sup> See *Orbe Cattolico a Pio Nono*, Rome, 1863.

the exercise of his apostolic ministry, and may clearly be seen to enjoy such freedom by the faithful of the whole universe.

And, mark once more, to avoid either “oracular confusion” or malicious misrepresentation, Pius IX. does not declare the temporal power necessary for the Church’s *existence* under all imaginable circumstances, as though God had promised that it should never in any way whatever be even temporarily taken away; but he does pronounce it *indispensable for the unimpeded exercise of her sacred power*, and, therefore, for her well-being and “the *real* of Catholicism.” In the Apostolical Letter, with which we are dealing, he made this absolutely clear: “Since,” he wrote, “in order to act with due freedom she needed those helps which *suit*ed the conditions and necessities of the times, it came to pass by an admirable counsel of Divine Providence, that when the Roman Empire fell and was divided into many kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff obtained a civil principedom. By which circumstance it was most wisely provided by God Himself, that, amidst so great a variety and multitude of temporal kings, the Supreme Pontiff should enjoy that political liberty which is so indispensable to the unimpeded exercise of his spiritual power over the whole world.”

To anyone who is not a Catholic merely in name, this much would suffice to command the perfect submission of his heart and mind to the pronouncement of the Vicar of Christ. But there remains for our consideration a still more striking and convincing document to show that the Pope and the episcopate have declared for this necessity of the temporal power in the most unmistakable terms. As I write I have before me Part the Seventh of the publication entitled *La Sovranità Temporale dei Romani Pontefici*<sup>1</sup>—a collection containing the declarations of Pope, cardinals, bishops, priests, and people—in a word the suffrage of the Universal Church for the temporal power. In this volume

<sup>1</sup> *Roma. Coi tipi della Civiltà Cattolica*, 1863. From 1860 to 1864, this work reached twenty-four vols.

I read that on June 9th, 1862, a great consistory was held, in which the indispensability of the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See was declared in a perfectly uncompromising and authoritative way by Pius IX., and by all the bishops present. Moreover, an address was signed by no less than six hundred and thirty-one bishops from all parts of the world, stating their unqualified adherence to the doctrine put forth by the Pope in the documents we have already quoted, and in the famous allocution of that ever-memorable Whit Monday, 1863. Here is a conspectus<sup>1</sup> of the suffrage of the Catholic episcopate on this grave question, which to our flippant theological diplomatist is "a mere opinion":—

A.	Prelates who subscribed the address of adhesion to the pronouncements of Pius IX., June 9th, 1863.	
	Of the Latin Rite, 596: of the Oriental Rite, 45.	631
B.	Sees vacant from June, 1862, to August, 1863, and, consequently, not represented in the Address,	46
C.	Prelates, whose names do not appear among the subscriptions to the Address, but who had nevertheless proclaimed by their conduct and their language their <i>express</i> and practical adherence, <sup>2</sup>	92
D.	Add to these 631 <i>Essential</i> Prelates, subscribing the Address, Bishops in <i>partibus</i> almost all Prefects, or Delegates, or Vicars Apostolic in missionary districts,	77
E.	Prelates, whose public action on this question was not known in 1863, but whose <i>tacit</i> consent, at least, can be counted,	83

The whole Catholic hierarchy, then, in a solemn declaration of faith and obedience accepted as an authoritative decision of the head of Christ's Church the pronouncement of Pius IX. I say the whole Catholic hierarchy, that is the teaching Church, solemnly accepted the declaration that the "civil principedom of the Holy See was, by the special design of Divine Providence granted to the Roman Pontiff; and that the same is necessary, in order that he may, by being always free from subjection to any prince or civil power, exercise in full freedom his supreme power and authority to

<sup>1</sup> See the collection just quoted, page 13 and *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> See same collection, where the acts of these bishops are printed and recorded.



feed and govern, through the Universal Church, the entire flock of our Lord; and thus provide for the weal, the interests, and needs of the Church.”<sup>1</sup> Listen now to the unwavering voice of the bishops in answer to this clear pronouncement:—

“We recognise the civil principedom of the Holy See as a necessary appurtenance, and as manifestly instituted by the Providence of God. Nor do we hesitate to declare, that, *in the present condition of the world’s affairs*, this temporal sovereignty is *absolutely indispensable for the good and free government of the Church* and of men’s souls. It was assuredly necessary that the Roman Pontiff, the head of the whole Church, should not be the subject of any sovereign, nay, nor the guest of any; but that, established in his own dominions and kingdom, he should be his own master; and in noble, peaceful, and gentle liberty, should defend and protect the Catholic faith, and rule and govern the whole Christian commonwealth.”<sup>2</sup>

As if this “splendid and *final*” enunciation of the matter,” were not enough, the bishops, wishing to deprive disloyal Catholics of any chance of subterfuge, proceed to declare—(1) that it is binding on all Catholics to believe the doctrine of the necessity of the temporal power of the Pope for the full and free exercise of his spiritual office; and (2) that they had heard the Pope speaking *as master of the Church, and not as a private author* or teacher (*non tam dissidentem quam docentem*).

“But it is scarcely becoming in us to speak more at length on this so grave a matter: in us, who have so often heard you, *we do not say merely dealing with this question, but speaking on it with the authority of our Master*.<sup>3</sup> For your voice, like a sacerdotal trumpet, has loudly proclaimed to all the world that ‘the temporal power is providential.’ It must, therefore, be held by us all as most certain that this temporal sway has been granted to the Holy See not fortuitously, but by a special Providence.”

Here we have nine-tenths of the whole hierarchy *expressly* accepting the position that, since the Pope has declared

<sup>1</sup>Allocution of Pius IX., “*Juvat*,” &c., page 10 of Part Seven of the *Sovranità*, &c.

<sup>2</sup>See same place, page 17, “*Civilem enim*,” &c.

<sup>3</sup>Card. Manning, *Temp. Power of Pope*, page 238.

<sup>4</sup>This I maintain to be the proper sense of “*non tam dissidentem quam docentem*,” especially after “*audio*.”

the indispensability, under the present order of things, of the civil principedom and its specially providential origin, they, and consequently the faithful committed to their direction, are under the obligation of "holding most certainly" the doctrine so plainly and authoritatively propounded. But here, to prevent our anonymous diplomatist from falling into any further "oracular confusion," we must distinguish two kinds of *certainly* belonging to dogmatical propositions; viz., the certainty of divine faith and theological certainty. The proposition that civil dominion is necessary for the unimpeded and full discharge of the divine mission of the Holy See, is not invested with the first kind of certainty; nor would he that denied it be a heretic; but his pertinacious rejection of a proposition, which is, as we have shown, *theologicæ certæ*, would deserve the lighter censure of *temerarie et erronee*. I will support this statement further by a document emanating from the Sacred Penitentiary under the date May 28th, 1863:<sup>1</sup>

" FORMULA OF RETRACTATION.

"I N. N. confess and affirm it to be *error* and *temerity* to contradict the manifest doctrine of the Church, and that *not without grave sin* can one refuse obedience and sincere submission to the authority of the Holy See; and, therefore, do I respect and conform myself unto all the declarations of the same Holy See, and especially to those which regard the temporal dominion of the Supreme Pontiff, and have been re-echoed by the entire Episcopate.

" A. M. Card. CAGIANO, M.P.

" L. PEIRANO, S. P. Secret."

We may be allowed strongly but respectfully to recommend this formula to the anonymous writer, who has taken on himself to expound the duties of Catholics in the *Protestant Contemporary*.

It is, therefore, evident that this positive and clear declaration of the bishops of the whole world was not the

<sup>1</sup> See Steccanella, *as above*, page 480. We might still further confirm our position by citing another document from the same source declaring that those who signed any paper petitioning our Holy Father *voluntarily* to divest himself of his temporal power, incur the penalty of excommunication *ipso facto*. *Ibid.*

simple affirmation of a “view,” an opinion more or less probable, but a solemn judgment imposing an obligation of sincere adhesion on the conscience of every Catholic—a definite sentence sanctioned by severest canonical censures—in a word, a sentence to which all were bound to submit in intellect and in will, in word and in deed, so that no risk or peril—not even the danger of death itself—could exempt a faithful son of the Church from upholding it in theory and practice. Hear the entire body of the “teaching Church”<sup>1</sup> once more :—

“In words of lofty and solemn import you likewise declared your constant resolution to defend and preserve intact and inviolate the civil principedom of the Roman Church and its temporal possessions and rights, *in which the whole Catholic world is concerned*, nay, from you we know, *that to all Catholics belongs the duty of defending the temporal sovereignty and the patrimony of St. Peter*. You have further proclaimed that you were ready to give your life rather than abandon in any wise this sacred cause, *which is the cause of God, of the Church, and of justice*. To this noble language we answer, with sincere acclaim, that we are ready to go with you to prison and to death, and we humbly pray you to remain immovably constant and steadfast in your resolve,” &c.

From this strong document we naturally draw the following important practical conclusions:—<sup>2</sup>

I. The necessity to the Roman Pontiff of the civil principedom in the present order of divine Providence has been asserted in terms so clear and precise that only ignorance or malice can find room for doubt or difficulty.

II. It has been asserted as a truth closely bound up with belief, as a precept inducing the strictest obligation of conscience.

III. No Catholic can run counter to it, without the guilt of serious disloyalty and disobedience, without rashly contradicting a truth authentically set forth, and without incurring grave ecclesiastical censure.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> At the same Consistory. See *Sovranita Temp.*, page 20, “*Id etiam*,” &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Sovranita*, page 21.

<sup>3</sup> These censures have been somewhat modified by the *Constitutio Apostolicæ Sedis*, on which see Bucceroni’s *Commentary*, page 32.

One word more on this point. I have in my hand a little work entitled *Leone XIII. e Il Potere Temporale dei Papi*, which contains the various pronouncements of the reigning Pontiff on the same question. Anyone who imagines that the times have changed the attitude of the Holy See, and therefore our duty in regard to this all-important matter, had better consult this book, or any good collection of the Acts and Encyclicals of Leo XIII.; and he will find that never has a year passed of the fifteen years of Leo's reign without as strong and as solemn declarations and protests, to the same identical effect, as those which Pius IX. uttered from the commencement of his Pontificate to its very end.

To the anonymous author of the article on the *Pope and the Bible*, we, therefore, answer: It is true you were grievously mistaken, as Father Brandi told you, in supposing this question to be still open to discussion. It has been decided long ago, "solemnly decided that the temporal power is necessary to the freedom of the Church, and the crowd of the faithful must bow before the decision." "By what mysterious agency," you ask, "has this important truth been discovered and promulgated?" And I answer, in Father Brandi's words—words which only your "oracular confusion" or your dishonesty can allow you to misunderstand—by the "teaching Church" it has been promulgated *etc.*, by the whole body of the Catholic Episcopate, both in their ordinary teaching, and in their solemn proclamations with the Sovereign Pontiff at their head; "and for a Catholic" such as you profess yourself—"that must suffice."

II. But, objects our author, this declaration is not a dogma, and can never be a dogma, for the whole question lies outside the Apostolic *Depositum*, and the "teaching Church," therefore, has not and cannot possess infallibility in its decision.

I. To the antecedent of this argument, and "the oracular confusion" involved in it between the *de jure* and the *de facto* possession of temporal power, I simply say *transcat* for the moment.

2. Let it be noticed that the anonymous theologian of the



*Contemporary* here assumes<sup>1</sup> that nothing is obligatory on all Catholics unless it be embodied in a dogma or definition of faith; or, in other words, that interior assent and practical adherence is due to no other doctrines save to those only which have been defined by Pope or Council. No idea can be broached so plainly fallacious and absurd. For, apart from the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, perhaps, no doctrine was ever defined by the Church except after heresy had arisen to attack some special point of her general or ordinary teaching. Therefore the *suppositum* of the *Contemporary's* diplomatic theologian, viz., that the Church does not bind her sons to believe a doctrine as of faith before defining it, is reducible to the obviously absurd assertion, that until heresies arose she had no faith at all; that is, no *magisterium* whatever, but only a string of private opinions; in fact, that the Church was only a “viewy” synagogue of disconnected members. Such a supposition, if admitted, would lead naturally to the “Paulinism” and “Petrinism” of the German Rationalists. We cannot be doing an injustice in supposing that our author has this baneful admission lurking in the recesses of his “oracular confusion,” when we see how apparently oblivious he is to the fact that the Vatican Council clearly defined<sup>2</sup> the Church to be infallible not only in her solemn declarations, but also in her ordinary and general teaching.

3. We will eliminate one more element of his confusion by distinguishing the conclusion of his argument. And in doing so Father Steccanella<sup>3</sup> shall be our guide. Would that our author could be induced to take the pains to read some of the literature on the subject with which he pretends to deal. He would in that case find that he is only serving up *crambe repetitum*, and forcing Father Brandi to bring forward again the answers to old objections that have been disposed of for more than a quarter of a century.

The term dogma, then, is equivocal, and requires a

<sup>1</sup> I should rather say, perhaps, that he categorically asserts this absurd position throughout his article.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. *Dei Filius*.

<sup>3</sup> “Il valore e la violazione della dichiarazione.”

qualification. We may have either a *dogma of faith* or a *dogma of indubitable certainty*, indeed, *but of a lower grade*. A dogma of faith proposes to the people articles of belief, solemnly defined, and binding all men to sincere assent under pain of *anathema* or *note of heresy*: it is a *rule of faith strictly so called*. But a dogma of indubitable certainty of a lower grade, is any authoritative instruction to the whole flock of Christ, the contrary of which would be theologically unsound; or, in other words, a dogmatical judgment serving to direct the faithful in matters more or less proximately connected with faith. It is a *rule of faith less strictly so called*, which does not propose an article of faith nor impose obligation of assent under pain of *heresy*, but which the Church nevertheless inerrably determines, because of the Holy Ghost's infallible assistance—not, observe, because of any "*revelation to Pope or Council*"—and which embraces any truth whatsoever having relation to faith or morals, even though that truth may not have been directly pronounced by God. To such a dogma, or rule of faith less strictly so called, we owe the sincere assent of our minds and hearts, but not that which is properly speaking an act of faith; so that he who dares to reject it is guilty not of heresy, but of disobedience, rashness, or schism. To this latter class belongs the doctrine of the temporal power, so that no Catholic can pertinaciously refuse to admit of it without *ipso facto* incurring a very grievous censure.<sup>1</sup>

His Eminence Cardinal Manning, writing two years before the solemn address of the Catholic Episcopate to Pius IX., of which we have spoken, has this identical doctrine:—

"The local sovereignty of the Vicar of our Lord over Rome and the Marches, was a fact in Providence many centuries afterwards, and as such can form no proper or *direct* matter of a *dogma of faith*. . . . Nevertheless, the temporal sovereignty affords abundant and proper matter for a definition, or judgment, or authoritative declaration of the Church, like the disciplinary decrees of General Councils: or, finally, the authoritative sentences in the Bulls of Pontiffs, of which many relate to discipline, to *ecclesiastical and moral questions* bearing on temporal things."

<sup>1</sup> Steccanella, as above, page 88; see also Dr. Ward, *Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, pages 30-34.

And the Church’s authoritative sentence on this head “would be binding on the consciences of all the faithful,” and the contrary would be noted as ‘*propositio falsa, jurius Concilium Generalium et summorum Pontificum laesiva, scandalosa, et schismati fovens.*’ (See Bull *Auctorem Fidei*.) And yet the subject-matter may not be among the original articles of revealed doctrine, but of *the nature of a dogmatic fact attaching* to a divine doctrine and institution, viz., the Vicariate of St. Peter and his successors.”

III. Here, however, it is time to examine the common objection, stated in his own way by our author, which has been so constantly advanced by ignorant or weak-kneed Catholics and heretics against the civil principedom of the Papacy. St. Peter and the early Popes had not the temporal power; therefore, it cannot be necessary for the Holy See and “the weal of Catholicism.”

This is a most illegitimate inference *a non esse ad non posse*: what is *de facto* is often not at all *de jure*, and what is *de jure* is often not *de facto*. The whole argument amounts to a servile adoration of *faits accomplis*. Those who are guilty of it would, no doubt, have been just the men to yield to the insidious persecution of Julian the Apostate, on the plea that they could not resist the “spirit of the age!” “the trend and goal of the times!” With our anonymous worshipper of accomplished facts, “their pious commentary on the loss” (not only) “of the temporal power,” but of their liberty, of their goods, of their education, of their pastors, would have been “the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away.”<sup>1</sup>

Here I must beg leave to cite the answer given to this objection by Leo XIII., when Archbishop-Bishop of Perugia, in a pastoral to his flock in 1860.

“*The idea of spiritual primacy over the whole Church implies entire abhorrence to temporal subjection.* It is true the Pontiffs of the early ages enjoyed *the independence not of the prince but of the martyr*, and this by the wise design of that Providence, who would have the world to know that the propagation of His Church was entirely the work of His hands, and had no aid

from the power of man. Thus, in those days the Roman Pontiffs were *de facto* subject to civil princes, but we cannot conceive that this state of subjection was ever for an instant theirs *de jure*. The supreme spiritual power of the Papacy bore with it from its birth the germ of the temporal sway; and with the spontaneous development of the former, the latter too went on unfolding itself through time and space, according to the external conditions by which it was attended. This is the common law, which overrules the growth of all things here below: at first they are imperceptible: shut in, as it were, in their seed or germ, which according to the various provinces of matter found meet for the concentration of its forces, goes from stage to stage till its full and proper development is attained. Thus by nature does the man enjoy that use and free expansion of the reason which was at first so imperfect in the child; thus by nature are the trees enriched with fruit which in their early days they did not yield. Lastly, just as from the natural increase of families into townships and boroughs civil society took root and sprang into being—for it was contained, we may so say, in the family as in its primal elements—so from the nature and peculiar attributes of the spiritual primacy, did the temporal dominion of the Popes, in the time and under the circumstances foreordained by God, spontaneously arise. And therefore does history point to amplest gifts, to vast possessions, and to acts of civil jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiffs, reaching so far back as to touch upon the earliest ages of the Church. Nor does there appear any other possible explanation of that truly extraordinary phenomenon of power come into their hands without their knowledge and in their own despite, as is declared and proved by the renowned De Maistre. (*Du Pape*, Bk. i., c. 6.) Those, therefore, who wish the Pontiff stripped of the civil principedom, wish the Church back in her infancy at the outset of her existence—nay, more, with this enormous difference, they desire that the state of things, which is proper and ordinary, and answering to the nature of Christianity, should be that which was merely the primitive and initial stage on her way to those heights for which she was predestined by that Eternal Providence, who from catacomb and prison, along the blood-stained road of martyrdom, brought her Pontiffs to sit upon the throne of the persecuting Caesars."

The temporal over-lordship of the Sovereign Pontiffs, was, consequently, not manifested from the beginning, because it was not in itself a divine institution, but only the natural consequence of such an institution. The effect comes after the cause; the oak springs up after the seed has been planted and the roots become fixed. We grant that the temporal sovereignty was not conferred *actually* by



Christ on His Vicar, St. Peter, but it was bestowed on him *virtually*. The first germ of the civil principedom was the divine origin of the kingdom of Christ or His Church, which necessarily require in its supreme ruler complete liberty and perfect independence from the powers of the world—a liberty and independence which cannot subsist without temporal sovereignty.<sup>1</sup>

But, if the zealous Catholic of the *Contemporary* still thinks that the doctrine of the necessity or indispensability of the temporal power is supported only by the "opaque school of theologians," or the self-constituted "teaching Church" of the Jesuits (!) let him interrogate the words, writings, and deeds of the enemies of Christianity. The history of the Italian revolution is an eloquent declaration of the close connection of the temporal power with the spiritual supremacy, and an irrefragable proof of the absolute indispensability of the civil principedom of the Pope for the rightful and proper exercise of his supreme office.<sup>2</sup> For the consolation of ourselves and our anonymous writer, let us read the spontaneous witness of some of our enemies to the necessity of the triple crown.<sup>3</sup> *Ex uno disc omnes* : "Depose the Popes from their temporal throne," wrote Proudhon, the socialist, "and Catholicism at once degenerates into Protestantism; religion dissolves itself into dust. They who say that the Pope will be heard to better effect, when he is occupied exclusively with the affairs of heaven, are *either politicians in bad faith*, who study to mask in devout words their criminal action; or *imbecile Catholics*, who are not able to comprehend that, in the things of this life, the temporal and spiritual are inseparable—just precisely as are body and soul." From the mouths of our foes, then, if not from the general sentiment of Catholic Christendom, if not from the authoritative declaration of the "teaching Church"—understanding that term in its proper sense, and not wilfully

<sup>1</sup> Father Liberatore *La Chiesa e lo Stato*, page 436, &c., where a similar passage occurs to the one we have cited from Leo XIII.

<sup>2</sup> See the O'Clery's *Making of Italy*, and Canon Maglione's, *The Vatican and the Kingdom of Italy*.

<sup>3</sup> My space prevents me from citing more than one of the many testimonials I have before me from our enemies.

abusing it—every Catholic should learn the indispensability of the civil principedom, in the existing order of Divine Providence and under the present circumstances—for the *well-being* of the Holy See and the “*wel of Catholicism*.”

But a loyal Catholic needs no other rule but only this: “*Sentire cum Ecclesia*.” In these perilous times, when the waters of unbelief have entered into the souls of many, when there are those amongst us who, seeking false peace, attempt ruinous compromise with our foes, this maxim is of supremest import. In very deed, there is no peace save through the truth; and there is no security for truth, even of the natural order, except in the most humble and unreserved submission to the judgment of the Church.

A. HINSLEY.

## Theological Questions.

### “PULLING” HORSES AT RACES, AND BETTING.

1. In the February number of this journal we treated of several questions connected with racing and betting. We stated—1. “That the owner of a horse is not bound towards the *betting-men* to run a *bona fide* race.” He may not conspire with one betting-man to injure another. But, such collusion apart, he owes them no obligation in justice. Neither is he bound towards the race committee or the public at large to run a *bona fide* race. He pays his entrance fee; he does not, let us suppose, intend to win the race, and consequently will get nothing from the committee or public; the public may not attend the race at all; and hence he may run his horse as he pleases. We may even conceive a case where a person would win the stakes, and still give very little value to the public. Two horses, for example, enter for a race; one of them gets completely disabled before half the race is run, and the other may canter leisurely home,

and win the race, without giving much entertainment to the race committee or the public.

2. In the February number we stated—2. “That it is not *unlawful* to ‘pull’ a horse for the purpose of getting *light weight* at a *future race*.” Success at racing depends on the capacity and effort of the horses, and no horse-owner has a right that his neighbour’s horse should be specially weighted, just as a candidate for a university fellowship has no right that his rival should be handicapped; and hence, when horses are entered for a race, no injury would be done to the owners, even should there be no handicapping. The race committee, however, interferes, and tries to equalise the horses by a careful scale of weights. But this interference with the natural capacity of the horses must be rigidly interpreted, and must not be assumed to impose a conscientious obligation, unless it be clearly proved. In the absence of such proof, and resting on good positive reasons for the contrary, we regard this handicapping as a purely *penal* regulation, which imposes no direct obligation on conscience. In proof of this, we pointed out, in the February number, that celebrated athletes sometimes lose races, which, judging from their previous victories, they should win; and yet they are not punished, nor accounted guilty of injustice. Again, a person may never have run his horse before, and may have concealed his merits, or even published unfavourable reports of him in the newspapers, and so secured an unduly favourable handicapping for a future race; and yet he would not be guilty of *injustice*. Or, finally, we may suppose a more cogent case. A man, let us suppose, enters his horse for a race, and without collusion with betting-men, or *without reference to any future race*, “pulls” the horse and prevents him from winning. This man does no injustice to anyone, to betting-men, race committee, or the public generally; and yet, if detected, he would be punished for foul riding. Hence we may conclude that these regulations are penal. Now, if this man escaped detection, changed his mind, and entered his horse for a future race, no one would say that he was bound to apprise the official handicapper of having “pulled” his horse at a former race. And if it is lawful to

accept light weights after the horse has been "pulled," and the handicapper deceived, it would be also lawful even if the horse were "pulled" for the *purpose* of getting light weights at a future race: for the intention of doing what is in itself just and lawful, cannot be unlawful.

3. So far no objection has been raised to the views we expressed in the February number of this periodical. Exception has, however, been taken to the remaining portion of our article by "Sacerdos Midensis," in the March number of the I. E. RECORD, and by "Repentant 'puller,'" and others in private communications. We shall be able to reply to all our correspondents with greatest convenience by discussing—1. Is it lawful for a person to bet *on* a horse when it is *certain* that the horse will win? 2. Is it lawful for a bookmaker to bribe a jockey, or for a master to order his jockey to "pull" the horse, and by betting *against* him win the wager? And 3. How are such persons to be dealt with in the confessional?

### § 1.

Is it lawful to bet on a horse when it is *certain* that the horse will win?

4. In our last article we discussed this question in connection with "pulling." We put the case in this way:—

"A person, for example, has his horse entered for a future race; he is unrivalled, let us suppose, in estimating the relative merits of horses, and he is quite confident that his own horse can easily beat any of the other horses entered for the future race. Meanwhile his horse is engaged to run another race presently, and he 'drugs' the horse, or 'pulls' him, and loses the race, in order to deceive the public and create the impression that the horse is unable to win the future race. The public then bet *against* the horse; the owner bets a considerable sum *on* the horse, and wins; has he acted lawfully, and may he keep the bet?"

And our reply, substantially, was—(a) that he acted unjustly, and could not keep the bet, as he was *certain* of winning the race; (b) that, notwithstanding his *subjective* certainty, if it were afterwards discovered that the event was really and *objectively* uncertain, he could keep the bet; and we quoted Crolley: "Præterea si Caius qui se certum credidit



tempore sponsionis postea compereat eventum *revera fuisse incertum*, potest lucrum accipere si vicerit, quia re vera se periculo damni exposuit; quamvis contra suam conscientiam spondendo peccavit;" and (c) that if he unexpectedly lost the race, he should regard the bet as valid, and pay the wager, for the reason given by Crolly; namely, that the issue of the race was really uncertain, though he thought he should certainly win.

5. The letter of "Sacerdos Midensis" gives us an opportunity of stating our views more fully and clearly on this phase of the question; but we will first see what theologians say to the general question, "Is it lawful to bet when a person is *certain* of winning?"

6. To commence with a Maynooth theologian, Crolly writes as follows:—

"Circa 1<sup>am</sup> conditionem conveniunt theologi eum non posse spondere qui re vera certus est de eventu. Si vero is qui in initio crediderit se certum esse de eventu, postea ex negatione constanti alterius incipit dubitare; aut si, quamvis se certum esse putaret, attamen haesitaret, quia saepe expertus est se fuisse deceptum in eis, quae illi certa videbantur, potest juste spondere, quia ex his principiis reflexis vere incertus efficitur. Praeterea si Caius, qui se certum credidit tempore sponsionis, postea compereat eventum *revera fuisse incertum*, potest lucrum accipere si vicerit, quia *revera* se periculo damni exposuit: quamvis contra suam conscientiam spondendo peccavit. Quidam admittunt Caium, quamquam veritatem rei de qua disceptatur certo scit, adhuc posse spondere, *dummodo moneat Julium* alterum spondentem *se omnino certum esse*; communiter tamen negant theologi, quia Julius Caio non credidit, aliter enim certo non spopondisset. Et haece sententia tenenda est si Caius *revera* certus sit; idem enim est ac si Julius massam auri, quam aes esse credit, parvo pretio offerat Caio qui sciens aurum esse hoc declarat Julio, qui tamen, iudicio suo falso confidens, eam esse aes credere persistat. Hoc tamen non obstante Caius eam pretio massae aeris emere nequit."<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, Lehmkühl writes:—

"Si igitur unus spondentium *certus* est de re, sponsionem cum altero inire nequit; immo communiter non sufficit quidem, ut dicat se certum esse."<sup>2</sup>

Finally, Laymann, who contends that a bet may be

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii., pp. 669-670.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i., page 722.

valid though one of the parties to it should be certain of the result, states his doctrine thus :—

"Si in *aperte periculumis* causa super qua sponsio fit perspicuissimum nihil esset: atque alter nihilominus errore inductus, tecum certare et atque deponere velit, an hoc casu ipsum spondentem tibi obligare potes? Negat Molina . . . Sed contrarium est verum," &c. (L. iii., Tr. iv., cap. xxi., n. 4.)

7. To apply these principles to betting on races, and to the case proposed in No. 4, we would say :—1. According to the teaching of Crolley, which we fully accept, *uncertainty* about the result of the race is essential for betting. Uncertainty, however, may be *subjective*, or *objective*, or both. It is merely *subjective*, when the issue is in itself absolutely certain (as, for example, that Christmas Eve is a fast day); but some individual is uncertain about it, or has some doubt about it in his mind. It is merely *objective* when the result of the bet is in itself really uncertain, though one of the parties to the bet may be certain in his mind that he would win. It is obvious, too, that the uncertainty can be both subjective and objective. Now, 2, subjective or objective uncertainty is sufficient for the *validity* of a bet. Hence, if two persons bet as to whether Christmas Eve is a fast day or not, the bet is valid if they are both *subjectively* uncertain about it, though the result of the bet is *objectively* certain; and, similarly, if the issue is *objectively* uncertain, the bet is *valid*, though one may have believed that he would certainly win. But it is not *lawful* for a person to bet, when *he believes for certain* that he will win. 3. With regard to racing, we cannot undertake to determine whether, pulling and collusion apart, there can be ever *real objective certainty* about the result; or whether a bet on a race can be ever *invalid* for want of *uncertainty*. And hence we can only lay down the abstract general propositions already enunciated, viz.: (a) It is not *lawful* to bet when a person is certain of the result. (b) If there is no *uncertainty*, objective or subjective, about the result, the bet is *invalid*. (c) If a person, when making a bet, *believes for certain* that he will win, but afterwards discovers that the issue is really doubtful, the bet is, of course, *valid*, though *unlawful*; and, as it may

be said that, if we exclude fraud, there is always some uncertainty about the result of a race, it may be contended that betting is never *invalid* on the score of uncertainty. Finally (*d*) it is *unlawful* for a person, who believes that he will certainly win a certain race, to positively deceive the public, and induce them to bet *against* his horse, in order that he himself, by betting *on* the horse, may win their money. All the theologians are agreed that a person, who is certain of winning a bet, should apprize his opponent of the fact; and hence it cannot be lawful to positively mislead the public, and induce them to bet on what is believed to be the losing side.

8. We believe that there is not much difference between our views, as thus explained, and the views of "Sacerdos Midensis." We will, however, in order to compare his position formally with our own, put his arguments in the form of objections to our doctrine.

9. *Obj.* 1. "Sacerdos Midensis" then would say: "There is, until a race is actually won, always an uncertainty as to the result. Hence the bet is *always valid*, and, if made *bona fide*, lawful also." To this we reply, that if there is uncertainty about the issue, the bet is certainly valid. It may be said too, that, fraudulent pre-arrangement apart, there is always, at the time of starting, an uncertainty about the result. The result may become really certain during the race. Two horses, let us suppose, are running a flat race; one becomes completely disabled, and the other performs the remainder of the journey leisurely. Of course even this horse *may* suddenly drop dead; but, nevertheless, we think that this mere possibility of danger does not constitute an uncertainty, which can be morally and commercially considered, at least *a priori*, in making a bet; and hence we consider that a "bookmaker" present on the course, and familiar with the circumstances of the case, could not accept a bet *against* this horse from, let us say, an absent client.

10. *Obj.* 2. "Sacerdos Midensis" would say, secondly: "If a man, who had never raced his horse before, but trained him privately and secretly, bet *on* his horse, the bet would

be valid, even though the owner were quite confident of winning, and the public knew nothing of the horse. Therefore, there is no injustice in entering a horse for a present race, and "pulling" him, in order to deceive the public and induce them to bet *against* the horse at a future race, which he is certain to win; so that the owner may bet *on* him and win the wager." To this we answer: (a) The bet would be *valid* in both cases, if the result were really uncertain; and the bet would be *invalid* in both cases, if there were no uncertainty, objective or subjective, about the final issue. We may, however, generally assume the bets to be valid. But (b) it is certainly *unjust* and *unlawful* to try by deception to induce the public to bet *against* a horse, that is expected to have a certain and easy victory. (c) Theologians teach that, if a betting-man is certain of the result, he should at least inform his opponent of his certainty. In betting on races people do not expect this, and are quite satisfied if no deception is practiced on them. In the supposed parallel case of our correspondent, the man who trained his horse privately, in no way deceived the public; and, moreover, it may be said that he sufficiently warned all concerned; because, on the one hand, he mislead no person; and, on the other, the public themselves should be sufficiently warned that it is unsafe to bet *against* a horse of which they know nothing. There is, therefore, a great difference between the case mentioned by our correspondent and the case we discussed in the February number of this Journal.

11. *Obj.* 3. "Sacerdos Midenis" objects, thirdly: "A person, who 'pulls' his horse in order to get light weight at a future race, may accept the stakes at the future race, should he win it. Therefore, *a pari*, he may accept a bet won in the same manner." I would answer, *nego paritatem*. (a) A horse-race is a real *concursus*; betting is the contract we call *sponsio*. (b) A *concursus* does not necessarily suppose uncertainty nor equality among the combatants. In a *concursus*, let us say, for a university fellowship, one of the candidates may excel all the others in ability and attainments, and be certain of victory; and yet he is not



handicapped, but is accorded the victor's prize as the result of his examination. And so with racing. Handicapping is *penal*, and may be evaded. And the prize is given as the result of a particular horse's successful effort on the race-course. But (c) the contract of betting essentially supposes uncertainty; and if there be no uncertainty, the bet is absolutely invalid. Again, betting supposes equality; and if the inequality of chance of success is caused by deception, it is certainly unjust and unlawful. Consequently, it may be lawful to "pull" a horse in order to get light weight at a future race; but it is not lawful to "pull" the horse in order to deceive the public, and induce them to bet *against* him at a future race, which he is supposed to be certain of winning.

## § 2.

Is it lawful for a "bookmaker" to bribe a jockey, or for a master to order his jockey to "pull" the horse, and by betting against him win the wager?

12. In our article in the February number, we answered this question as follows:—

"(1) It is unlawful for the *bookmaker*. He is guilty of an injustice towards the owner of the horse, by depriving him of his chance of winning the race; and should indemnify him for his lost *chance*. He is guilty of injustice towards the betting-men; because he knows the horse will be "pulled;" and, therefore, by betting *against* the horse, he is *certain* to win the wager, while the others have no *chance* of winning; and hence the bet is invalid. . . .

"(2) It is unlawful for the *owner* to order the jockey to pull his horse with a view to betting *against* him. In this case, too, the bets are invalid," &c.

To this answer, also, so far as it regards betting, objection has been taken by correspondents. We shall have, however, to deal with these objections briefly, lest our paper be unduly prolonged.

13. *Obj.* 1. "In a game of cards, for example, it is lawful to practise the usual tricks of the game. Therefore, *a pari*, it is lawful to practise the usual tricks in betting." We reply: it is not lawful to employ at cards any tricks that are not known to all the players and sanctioned by custom.

Then they become the law of the game, and every player *has a chance of benefitting by them*. But when a jockey "pulls" his horse, and wins thereby a considerable sum of money, how have ordinary losers any practical chance of benefitting by the same trick, and winning back their money?

14. *Obj.* 2. "Betting-people know that 'bookmakers' often cheat. Therefore they are prepared to take a risk; and '*scienti et volenti non fit injuria*.'" To reply:—This objection deals specifically with "bookmakers;" and we may consider "bookmakers," first in relation to the general public, and secondly in relation to one another. (a) The general public have *no chance* of winning against a "bookmaker" who bribes the jockey; and hence the bet is invalid. Nor have we any reason to assume that "betters" condone the injury. No one is *certain* that he will be cheated: if he were, he would not bet at all. The people are, perhaps, aware that they *may* be cheated; and they are prepared to run a risk of having an *injustice* done to them, in order to have a chance of winning a good wager. If, however, an injustice is done, it remains an "*injuria*." Let us suppose a parallel case from ordinary commercial life. A flour merchant, suppose, has the reputation of *occasionally* mixing a considerable quantity of chalk with his flour. The people suspect that it happens now and then, and yet they patronise his shop. Do they therefore condone the injury, and exempt the merchant from his ordinary obligations? If so, half the injustice of the world should be called justice; and a merchant had only to announce that he is not over scrupulous in his dealings, when he may count on the consent of his customers to submit to a considerable measure of what ordinary people would call *injustice*.

(b) We would say the same when "bookmakers" bet with one another. If a "bookmaker" has sustained an injustice from another, and cannot otherwise obtain redress, he may have recourse to occult compensation. But it is absurd to suppose that an indiscriminate licence to cheat one another is accorded to the tribe of "bookmakers." If robbers steal from one another, is it not still theft or robbery? Finally, in all these cases there is a great difference between

antecedent condonation of injury, and the remission of restitution.

15. *Obj.* 3. Again, two horse-owners argue: "We keep race-horses for our own private good, and not to make sport for the public. Therefore we are justified in pursuing a give-and-take kind of policy. I will 'pull' my horse to-day, and bet *against* him, and you will win the race. And we will reverse the process on the next occasion." We reply: these gentlemen may race to secure personal advantages; but it must be according to the laws of justice. They may agree among themselves to win every second race, if they please; but their betting practices are decidedly objectionable.

### § 1.

#### HOW ARE ERRATIC "BOOKMAKERS" TO BE DEALT WITH IN THE CONFSSIONAL?

16. (*a*) A "bookmaker," such as we have been describing, should not be absolved unless he promised to abandon the unjust practices of his "profession." (*b*) Some of these "bookmakers" become, we are informed, enormously wealthy; and, of course, such persons should be compelled to make restitution according to the ordinary principles. (*c*) With reference to those who have done injury in the past, and who yet are very poor, it would be useless to speak to them of restitution. If a person had no other prospect before him during life but paying "betting debts," it would be apt to have an injurious effect on his future career, and do no good to the creditors. The Confessor might, however, require such persons to give some small sum in charity: and in all cases, where restitution should be made, if the injured persons are not known, it might be given to charitable institutions for the benefit of these to whom injury may have been done. And with regard to the *amount* to be restored, we would, as a general rule, require "bookmakers" to restore only what they would have actually won by fraud.

17. Finally, we think that a little information on the unscrupulous practices of "bookmakers" would preserve a number of innocent people from the loss of their money, and from the passion of betting, which is so easily acquired.

Hors, for example, are a few of their practices, which we quote from trustworthy correspondents: "They accept bets, when from private information they know the horse will not run;" "They bet on a race even after the result has come to hand by private wire." &c. These are sufficient to indicate the risks that simple people run in dealing with "book-makers."

DANIEL COGHLAN.

## Liturgical Questions.

### I.

QUESTIONS REGARDING—1. THE PRAYERS TO BE SAID AFTER LOW MASS. 2. THE CEREMONIES OF HOLY WEEK. 3. THE ALTAR-STONE.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall feel obliged if you answer in an early number of the I. H. Record the annexed liturgical questions. I have frequently discussed them with brother priests, but have been unable to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

"1. In reference to the prayers which are said after Low Mass by order of Leo XIII. (a) Are they to be said after a Low Mass celebrated in a private house? The phraseology of the Papal decree seems to apply to Masses said in churches. (b) When two or three Masses are said consecutively by the same priest, as on Christmas Day, must those prayers be said after each Mass, or only after the last, just as in the case of the 'De Profundis?'

"2. I am curate in a parish in which a convent adjoins the parochial church. In fact, the quasi-chapel is so placed that every morning their community Mass is celebrated at a side altar of the parochial church. Is it lawful to carry out in those circumstances the ceremonies of Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and Holy Saturday? I mean the ceremonies conducted *non extra aut sollemnitate* by a single priest. From Vavasseur, vol. iii., section 2, chap. i., I infer that these ceremonies (quasi-private) can be carried out only where there is a body of priests; here we have a parish priest and two curates. Besides, Vavasseur, in vol. i., page 16, seems to teach that the Masses should be public. What



if the service is held principally for the nuns, and scarcely any lay people attend?

“3. When saying Mass at ‘stations,’ priests often experience a difficulty in keeping on the altar-stone all the particles to be consecrated, especially if the number of communicants is large. Will it be sufficient to secure the presence of the particles on the corporal (*ante consecrationem*)? May we say that, on account of the particles being heaped together, they are, morally speaking, all on the altar-stone; though, in a physical sense, some are outside the altar-stone, but on the corporal? “NEO-SACERDOS.”

1. Both questions regarding the prayers to be recited after Mass have been already fully answered in the I. E. RECORD.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity, I will on the present occasion give merely the conclusions, referring those who wish to see the reasoning to the former reply.

(a) The prayers are to be said after a Low Mass wherever celebrated, whether in a church, chapel, oratory, or private house, or even *sub dio*.

(b) If on Christmas Day a priest says two or three Masses consecutively, he says the prayers only after the last one. This has been decided by the Congregation of Rites, April 30th, 1889.

2. I cannot see clearly how the proximity of the nuns' choir to the parochial church bears on this question. The whole difficulty, as I apprehend it, is that there are three priests in the parish; that this number is sufficient for the solemn ceremonies of Holy Week; and that, consequently, there is no justification for the private celebration of these ceremonies. Well, I think the privilege granted to parochial churches of using the *Memoriale Irituum* when a sufficient number of clergy for the solemn ritual cannot be had, is not intended to be so strictly interpreted. If each of the three priests were able to sing a part of the Passion creditably, and if they could be certain that during the time of the ceremonies none of them should be called away to attend a sick person, or to look after some other pressing parochial concern; and if, in addition to these priests so qualified,

<sup>1</sup> Third series, vol. xii., page 170, &c. (February, 1891).

there was a fairly good choir accustomed to the chanting of Solemn Mass, and a number of intelligent altar-boys trained in the ceremonies of Solemn Mass, the difficulty suggested in the question here put might be raised; but, in the ordinary circumstances of this country, the mere fact that a parish priest has two curates, does not exclude his parish church from the number of those for the benefit of which Benedict XIII. published the *Memoriale Rituum*.

The number of the faithful present, or likely to be present, at the functions of Holy Week, cannot modify in any way the obligations of the parish priest. In the circumstances mentioned in the question, the service is not held principally for the nuns, but in fulfilment of the parish priest's duty.

3. It is not lawful to consecrate any particle which is actually outside the altar-stone. The union existing among the different particles lying together in a loose heap is not such as to make those that are *really* outside the altar-stone *morally* within it. I may here remark, also, that the particles should remain on the altar-stone from the Consecration to the Communion, as the following quotation from Lacroix will show:—

"Non sufficit autem hostias esse in ara consecrata, dum consecrantur, verum etiam debent (tam parvae, quam magnae) in eadem relinqui tempore sacrificii, et non alibi (licet supra aliud corporale) dari, v.g. propter loci angustias, quia omnes sunt unica victima et per modum unius offeruntur."<sup>1</sup>

The same writer,<sup>2</sup> following De Lugo,<sup>3</sup> both of whom are quoted approvingly by St. Alphonsus,<sup>4</sup> infers, further, that it is not right (*omnino recte*) for a priest between the Consecration and Communion of his Mass to give particles which he has consecrated in that Mass to another priest that the latter may distribute Communion. However, all three writers agree that to do so, even without much cause, would not be a grievous sin; while if a grave cause existed, it might be done without any sin.

<sup>1</sup> Lib. vi., Dub. v., n. 308.  
*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Disp. xxx., *De Eucharistia*, n. 69.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. vi., n. 373.

## II.

## THE ANTIIPHON OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE DIVINE OFFICE.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—In a note in the *Ordo* for the Feast of the Purification it is mentioned that the *Antip. B. M. V.*, at the end of Lauds of Feria II., when said *ante occasum solis* on the preceding Sunday, is said standing. And for this it refers to a decree of the S. R. C., 12th November, 1831, ad 45.

“From this arose the question, how is the *Antip. B. M. V.* to be said, if Lauds for Feria II. are said *post occasum solis* on the preceding Sunday? In the same page that Falise gives the above-mentioned decree he has the following decree also:—

“‘An cum recitatur matutinum pro Feria II. in dominica præcedenti ante solis occasum, genuflecti debeat ad antiphonam finalem B. M. V.?’ Et S. R. C. respondit: Negative, et standum esse, dum matutinum recitatur ante solis occasum.’ 22 Aug., 1818, ad 8.

“According to this the S. R. C. would seem to indicate that it is only when Lauds of Feria II. are said *ante et non post occasum solis* on Sunday that the *Antip. B. M. V.* at the end is said standing. It is true that *occasus solis* may be understood to mean *usque ad crepusculum more indulgentiarum*. But, then, the same question arises: What if Lauds of Feria II. are said *post crepusculum* on Sunday?

“According to the decrees that I have been able to consult relating to the question, the rule would seem to be, the *Antip. B. M. V.* is said standing, after every part of Sunday’s office, *usque ad medium noctis*; and if Lauds of Feria II. be said *post crepusculum* on Sunday, then the *Antip. B. M. V.* at the end is said kneeling. Would you kindly say if this rule is correct: and, if not, what is the correct rule, and oblige

“RUBRICA.”

“Rubrica” has correctly interpreted the rubrics, and the decrees of the Congregation of Rites regarding the posture in which the antiphon of the Blessed Virgin is to be said. The rule he lays down is also correct, but may be more fully stated as follows:—The final antiphon of the Blessed Virgin is said standing during the whole of Paschal time, and on all Sundays in the year from the first vespers

said on Saturday—even though in Lent first vespers be said before mid-day—until dusk on Sunday, whether the Office be of Saturday, or of Sunday, or of Monday. But if Lauds of Monday be said after dusk on Sunday, the antiphon is said kneeling; whereas after any part of Sunday's Office up to midnight, the antiphon is said standing. On all other occasions it is said kneeling. The reason for the difference of posture is that during Paschal time, and on all Sundays of the year, we honour the Resurrection, as we do also by the Office of Sunday.

D. O'LOAN.

## Correspondence.

### THE FIRST PRAYER IN THE "MISSA QUOTIDIANA."

“REV. DEAR SIR,—As may have been expected from one in his eminent position, and of deservedly high authority on liturgical questions, Rev. Professor O’Loan has displayed much learning and ingenuity touching the above heading. But he appears to me to have missed the meaning of authentic decrees as well as of my conclusions from them. In order to make the more intelligible what I have to write, I must repeat these conclusions which regard not only the form but the order of prayers—that there can be no substitution for the first prayer *Deus qui inter apostolicos, &c.*, or for the third prayer, *Fidelium, &c.*, while only the prayer *pro patre et matre, &c.* can be substituted for the second prayer *Deus veniæ largitor*.

“My opponent contends that the decree of Aquen, 1741, does not restrict the substitution of the prayer for *Deus veniæ, &c.* to that *pro patre et matre, &c.* and founds his argument on a misquotation of the decree. My reference to it, as he can verify, gave the form *pro patre et matre, &c.*; but he replies by giving the form *pro patre, et matre, &c.*, adding that the *et* escaped my attention, and warranted any suitable prayer besides that for father and mother. In the first place, there should be no punctuation between *patre et matre*, or between those words and the *et*. Then the *et cetero* is not a sanction or equivalent for an indeterminate or any prayer, but is an abbreviation for the word *sacerdotis* in the Rubric which runs thus in the Missal: *pro patre et matre sacerdotis*. In several questions put to the S. C. R. from



time to time, and in its decrees in answer to them, the form *pro patre et matre* appears without the *de.*, as the partial heading *pro patre et matre* without the *de.*, sufficiently indicated the prayer. Professor O'Loan, then, must have followed some faulty transcriber of the decrees rather than Gardellini with whom they appear in their authentic form, and thus has founded an argument on a baseless foundation.

"What I have already written upsets another false position of the learned Professor; namely, that a prayer for a particular person may be used as a first prayer instead of the *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, and that this could be said in the second place. A question put to the S. C. R. ran thus: 'Potestne primo loco recitare Orationem *Inclina Domine* pro defuncto, vel orationem *Quæsumus Domine* pro defuncta, cujus ad intentionem eleemosyna data est; secundo loco pro defunctis Episcopis, &c.?' The answer was: 'Supposito quod negative, rescriptum prodiit "in missis quotidianis standum Missali."' "

"Again, in the year 1836, a question was put to the S. C. R.: 'Utrum pro oratione assignata primo loco alia subrogari potest, puta, pro patre et matre, offerente eleemosynam, &c.?' The answer was 'quoad primam Orationem servetur Ordo Missalis: quoad secundam detur decretum Aquen.' This decree (Aquen) decided that only the prayer *pro patre et matre* could be used for the *Deus Venie de.* But the learned Professor desiderates an answer such as *Positive* and *Negative* rather than *Standum Missali*; but he knows that the form of answer generally follows the form of the question; and this form was 'Utrum . . . sacerdos teneatur I loco Orationem pro def. Episcopis seu sacerdotibus, ut fert *Missale Romanum*?' "

"Furthermore we have a *dubium* in 1865: 'An in Missis quotidianis de Requiem sacerdos . . . celebrans pro aliqua vel pro aliquibus determinatis personis defunctis debet ne indiscriminatim dicere primam Orationem *Deus qui inter Apostolicos* primo loco in Missali assignatam, an potius loco primæ Orationis tenetur aliam dicere ex diversis in eodem Missali?' "

"Affirmative ad primam partem, Negative ad secundam."

"Nothing could be clearer. But Professor O'Loan replies that the decrees affect not the order of the prayers but their forms or substance. If, then, he understands the decree to mean that the *primam Orationem* (*Deus qui inter*) signifies not the first to be said, but the first in the Missal, what is the use of the next phrase *in primo loco in Missali assignatam*? Let us not

attribute such silly tautology to the learned and sacred Council, but listen to it as enjoining that 'the first prayer to be said, and given in the first place in the Missal, should be *Deus qui inter Apostolicos, &c.*'

By the way, in the decrees in their authentic form, the number and nature of the prayers to be said are given under the heading *Quæ* : while their order is given, in a different section, under the heading *Series* : which even of itself would prove it to be a mistake to suppose that the S. C. R. did not legislate on the order of the prayers.

Professor O'Loan, on the authority of the *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* refers to an academical discussion at which the V. G. of Rome presided, and, as alleged, favoured his opinion. The Professor adds: 'I might rest my case solely on the authority of Cardinal Parocchi . . . His word is law.' But we are under no obligation of verifying or believing the statement of the *Ephemerides*. Gardellini gives instances of false statements, to which now I merely allude, not only as to academical discussions, but even as to alleged decrees by the S. C. R. And even though the statement were true, we would not be bound to follow the opinion of Cardinal Parocchi. His word in this matter is not law for any of us. But the decrees, S. C. R., not however the unauthorised and faulty editions by Rubricists or copyists, are a law to us. Hence, in reply to questions, the S. C. R., on 23rd May, 1846, the 11th September, 1847, and 8th April, 1851, replied that the decrees in Gardellini 'are by the fact formally published, have the same authority as from the Pope himself, bind in conscience, and derogate from every contrary, even immemorial, custom.'

"SYLVESTER MALONE."

#### CONFRATERNITY OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

\* REV. DEAR SIR, To carry out the wish, nay the command, of our Holy Father, there will be soon, likely next month, a move to establish the devotion of the Holy Family in each home and family in Ireland. The I. E. Record, so well informed in every subject, would do a great and holy service by giving in next number a translation of all the documents, prayers, &c., and full information on the subject—I remain, very Rev. and dear Sir, yours truly.

"CORRESPONDENT."

[We thank our correspondent for his useful suggestion, and will attend to it.—Ed. I. E. R.]

## Notices of Books.

---

ŒUVRES DE SAINT FRANÇOIS DE SALES. Évêque de Genève et Docteur de l'Eglise. Tome I. Les Controverses. Annecy : Imprimerie J. Nîèrat.

THIS is the first volume of a splendid edition of the works of St. Francis de Sales, appropriately published in the town where the great Bishop of Geneva was buried. It is edited by Dom Benedict Mackey, O.S.B., a Canon of the diocese of Newport, in England, assisted by his brother, the Rev. P. Mackey, O.P., at present engaged in Rome in the publication of the Leonine edition of the works of St. Thomas. The wonderful success of the Bishop of Geneva in winning so many Protestants back to the Church must naturally attract the interest and attention of priests whose mission lies in the midst of Protestants. The spirit of St. Francis de Sales and the methods employed by him were the real secret of his success, and it is no wonder that they should be recommended in this practical form to those who have the conversion of England so much at heart. The first volume contains all the controversial works of St. Francis. In several short treatises the most important points of controversy between Catholics and Protestants are dealt with:—the origin of the Church; the mission and authority of her ministers; Protestant errors on the nature of the Church; the notes or marks of the true Church; the use of the Latin language in the offices of the Church; the Catholic rule of faith; the authority of the Bible, its genuineness, authenticity, and integrity; Purgatory; the Communion of Saints; the authority of Councils and of the Pope. All these questions are treated by St. Francis with great simplicity; but, at the same time, with an earnestness and originality highly calculated to make an impression, where perhaps more diffuse and pretentious works would fail completely. As this is the first complete edition of the works of St. Francis published since he was proclaimed a Doctor of the Church by the late Pope Pius IX., and as it is besides so admirably suited to the purpose for which it is intended, we need not do more than welcome its appearance and earnestly recommend it. Priests occupied on the mission where short sermons are required on matters of controversy with Protestants, could scarcely have a better book to consult for the purpose.

J. F. H

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF FAITH AND MORALS. By the Very Rev. William Byrne, D.D., Vicar-General of the Diocese of Boston. Boston: Cashman, Keating & Co., 611, Washington-street.

We have often met with people who were inquiring for some good book, either to put in the way of Protestants who were already favourably disposed towards the Catholic Church, or for converts who desired to be fully instructed in Catholic doctrine. We now think that a more suitable book for the purpose could scarcely be found than this new work by the respected Vicar-General of Boston. An excellent one had already come to us from beyond the Atlantic—the *Faith of Our Fathers*, by Cardinal Gibbons—a work which, as we have been informed, brought thousands of souls to the true fold. The Cardinal was obliged by the necessities of time and place to devote a good part of his volume to the proofs of the authority and infallibility of the Church and of its supreme pastor. Dr. Byrne takes in these questions in a very succinct manner; but he goes over the whole ground of Catholic faith and morals, and touches on almost every question of importance in the curriculum of theology. His explanations are necessarily very brief, but they are compact and to the point. His language is simple and clear, and not too technical. His work will be found useful also to the Catholic laity generally, and to advanced classes in schools and colleges.

As is almost inevitable in such a work, there are some slips, and a few inexact explanations in matters of secondary importance, particularly in the rubrical details at the end of the work; but, on the whole, it will, we believe, be found a perfectly safe and accurate exposition, as far as it goes, of Catholic doctrine. We wish it every success, and especially a wide circulation on this side of the Atlantic, where, we have no doubt, it will be found as useful as in America.

J. F. H.

HARRY DEE; OR, MAKING IT OUT. By the Rev. Francis J. Finn, S.J. Benziger Brothers, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati.

THE author of this story has done some excellent work for boys in America. He has published several other novels much in the same vein as this one, and, besides gaining an acknowledged place for himself in high-class American literature, he has



rendered by their publication an important service to the Catholic Church. It is a part of education to train and cultivate all the faculties with which Providence has endowed us; and if a man is to be turned out fully developed, not one, especially of the more important faculties, should be neglected. Boys in all countries have strong imaginations; and these not only require to be fed, but also to be regulated and trained, and in most countries this is done to a large extent by works of fiction. The more works of the kind suitable to youth a country possesses, the better. It is, no doubt, not easy for a priest to excel in their production. The gravity of his character will not admit the freedom in which lay writers can indulge without detriment to themselves or to others. Hence to a great extent in old countries the work has been left to educated laymen; and where they can be got to do it still, we think it would be just as well to leave them the monopoly. Nevertheless a man may be found from time to time amongst the clergy with special aptitudes and a fine sense of what is due to his priestly character, to produce a work of high literary merit, and specially suited to the purpose we have mentioned.

No doubt, attempts of the kind have often turned out to be exceedingly dull and dismal failures, and it was with a prejudice conceived and well founded against this class of book, that we, at the request of the editor, consented to look through the present work. We are glad, therefore, to be able to acknowledge its merits. There is not a dull page in it from beginning to end. It is a book which should captivate the imagination of a boy completely. It is full of noble thoughts and generous, manly sentiments. The lesson which it teaches is very artistically interwoven with the story, which has plenty of spirit and variety; and, we suppose, for the imagination of an American boy, not too much sensation or tragedy. Such a work must throw an unusual interest over the school or college whose life it describes. It is a useful addition to Catholic literature; not the only one, as we have said, contributed by its author; we are glad to give it a word of welcome, and to recommend it for the use of boys even on this side of the water. Boys must read, and it is well to have a book to give them that will interest them in their leisure hours and do them good.

J. F. H.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

JUNE, 1893.

---

## ON THE MITIGATION OF PUNISHMENT IN HELL.

THERE are very few errors either in theology or philosophy which do not arise in part or altogether from an inexact use of terms. Men fail to distinguish where distinction is absolutely necessary, and they consequently apply to the whole area covered by the various meanings of an ambiguous word what is really applicable to only a portion of its many significations. The doctrine of the mitigation of the punishment of the wicked in hell is a good instance of the danger of employing a word without a definite and sharply-cut conception of what is meant by it. If a man asks me whether I believe in any such mitigation, it is impossible for me to give him a direct answer, either affirmative or negative. I must question him as to the special kind of mitigation to which he is referring. For there is one sense, or even senses more than one, in which every Christian must admit the doctrine of mitigation. There are other senses in which it is an open question. There is also a sense, and perhaps the one which popular use most often attaches to it, in which it is utterly untenable and false. The object of the present article is to distinguish these various meanings, and discuss the assent or dissent that we must give to each of them.

Mitigation, if we look to the etymological force of the word, is a making more light or gentle that which is heavy or painful. Thus a prisoner at his trial has the opportunity sometimes afforded him of pleading for the mitigation of his

sentence ; by which we mean that he urges reasons why a lighter sentence should be passed upon him than was at first pronounced, or that the judge would be likely to pronounce without such representation on his part. So again we may say of some prisoner whose sentence was one that caused him great suffering, that after a time his sufferings were mitigated by the advent of a more humane gaoler, who did all in his power to render his life more tolerable. Mitigation, again, in whatever form it is conferred, may be either gradual and almost imperceptible in its beneficent work of lightening the burden to be borne or the pain to be endured, or it may be a sort of sudden leap from intense misery to comparative peace and comfort. It may have a certain definite limit, either of time or of the amount of suffering to be taken away ; or it may go on indefinitely until the pain has altogether ceased, and existence becomes either free alike from pleasure and pain (if such an existence is possible for a sentient being), or fraught with unmingled pleasure, as will be the case with the holy souls in purgatory as soon as their time of banishment from God is over. Before we can pass any opinion as to the possibility of a mitigation in hell, we must know how far it is employed as carrying with it certain concomitant circumstances such as these, which determine its specific nature.

1. In one sense every Christian believes in the mitigation of the punishment of the lost, in that God assigns to each a punishment that falls short of the amount of suffering that is deserved for sins committed. Even those who are suffering the most intense agony in hell will be compelled to say, in the words of Holy Scripture : " He hath not dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." (Ps. cii. 10.) This doctrine is very clearly stated by St. Thomas in Lib. iv., Sent. d. 46, q. 2, a. 2, where he says : " God gives beyond what men deserve of what is good, and always inflicts the penal sufferings (*mala poenae*) less than they deserve (*citra condignum*). " In answer to the difficulty that may be raised from certain texts in Holy Scripture, which seem to assert an exact correspondence between wrong done and punishment to be suffered (*e.g.*

Apoc. xviii. 7, Matt. vii. 2, James ii. 13), he says that the correspondence between wrong and punishment is one of proportion, not of absolute equality, and that the law of strict justice intervenes only after the mitigation that mercy imposes; and he then again declares that, as regards the proportion between the punishment and the sin absolutely considered, God always punishes *citra condignum*, for no one is punished as much as he deserves. In this sense, then, we may recognise the mercy of God as taking part even in the punishment of the lost: even in regard of them, "His mercy endureth for ever."

2. Mitigation, however, is more generally employed to indicate, not a certain alleviation of the sentence passed in the first instance, but a removal of a certain portion of the suffering which was at first endured, but after a time was gradually or at once removed. Can we allow in this sense of a mitigation of the penalty inflicted on the lost? Now, all punishment, like all reward, consists of certain pains and penalties that are essential to it, while it also carries with it other pains and penalties which may be termed accidental; remove the former, and the punishment is at an end; remove the latter, and it still remains in substance. If a man is sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment, with hard labour, we should say that if he had no labour whatever during ten months out of the twelve, he had not had the sentence carried out in substance on him. But if the sentence was to be imprisonment in some particular prison, and it was found desirable to remove him to another which happened to be more healthy, and where the labour to be performed was lighter, we should say that the change was an accidental one as affecting his punishment, and did not interfere with his having substantially carried out his sentence. Now, what are the penalties essential to the punishment of the lost? First and foremost, there is the *poena damni*, resulting from the consciousness that they have lost God, and that for ever. Besides this there is also the *poena sensus*, which involves a physical and positive suffering; inseparable, indeed, from the *poena damni*, but nevertheless distinct from it. Any mitigation which removes either of these in its entirety



would involve a substantial change in the condition of the lost, and could not be properly called mitigation at all. Any mitigation, therefore, must be limited to a partial removal of the suffering that is the result of the loss of God, or of the positive physical suffering that is the invariable accompaniment of it.

In the same way the character of the mitigation depends not only on the amount of suffering removed, but also on the period of time during which the alleviation lasts. If a man condemned to twelve months' imprisonment, with hard labour, were to be excused the labour for one or two days out of the three hundred and sixty-five, anyone would say that he had undergone the substantial part of his sentence, and that the mitigation was one which would still render it true that he had undergone the allotted time over which his sentence extended. The mitigation would be an accidental and insignificant one. Hence any mitigation in the sufferings of the lost which would relieve their sufferings either partially or wholly for some one day in the year, the previous suffering being renewed as before when it was over, would only be an accidental mitigation. The same would be true of any mitigation which merely affected the sufferings to be endured for a certain period of time, and did not alter the penalty that was to be inflicted to all eternity.

We are now able to determine in what sense and to what extent we may admit or assert a mitigation of the pains of hell, which shall supervene after their sufferings have begun. We will begin with a form of mitigation which cannot be seriously denied by anyone. Whenever a sinner makes a good confession, or a perfect act of contrition, every mortal sin is remitted. He is washed pure and clean in the precious blood, and the stains thus cleansed are gone for ever. No amount of subsequent sin can bring them back. Sin once forgiven leaves no sort of guilt behind. But though the guilt is gone, and the eternal punishment that was due to it is gone, there still may remain, and in point of fact there generally remains, a debt of punishment to be paid. This punishment is, however, a temporal, not an eternal punishment. If the man dies in the grace of God, the debt has to

be paid in purgatory. If he dies in sin, it has to be paid in hell. But whether in purgatory or hell, it still remains a temporal, and not an eternal punishment. No amount of subsequent sin can alter its character in this respect, and the fact of its having to be endured in hell does not in any way affect its transitory and terminable character. Hence when it has been paid it ceases.

This question, like almost every other conceivable question within the range of theology, is discussed by St. Thomas, in his Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard.<sup>1</sup> He is examining into the possibility of the re-appearance in the sinner of sins already forgiven, if he again lapses into serious sin; and he puts the following argument in favour of the possibility of their re-appearance.

Suppose, he says, that a man, after true contrition for his past sins, falls again into sin, and straightway dies, it is clear that he goes down to hell. Therefore he is punished there for the sins that had been forgiven, because the punishment was not entirely remitted. But the punishment in hell will last for ever; because in hell there is no redemption. Therefore he will have the same liability to punishment that he had before these sins were forgiven, and so it seems that in his case they come back; and the same is true of one who has confessed and not made full satisfaction. To this the saint answers, that if some part of the punishment was remitted in the confession or act of contrition, while another part remained, there will be no further punishment for the former, but there will for the latter. As to this residue, he says that some assert that it will be punished with a punishment that will last for ever, on account of the court in which the punishment is inflicted *ratione fori, in quo puniatur*. But this is not the opinion of St. Thomas himself. He lays down distinctly that the debt of punishment still due for sins of which the guilt is remitted, will be a temporal punishment. It does not follow from this that there will be any redemption in hell, for the penalty that is paid is not redeemed. Nor, he adds, is there any difficulty (*aliquid inconveniens*) in the fact that as regards a

<sup>1</sup> Dist. 22, q. 1, art. 1, q. 5.

certain accidental part of it, the punishment of hell may be diminished up to the day of judgment, as it may also be augmented.

Here we have, in a few clear and concise words, the solution of the question as to their being any mitigation in the punishment of hell. There is such a mitigation, says the Angelic Doctor. If a man, a short time before his death, has made a good confession, and so got rid of the eternal punishment due to his sins, that punishment does not reappear if he again falls into mortal sin, and in it dies. It is gone, and gone for ever. But whatever temporal punishment may still be due for the sins thus forgiven, will have to be paid in hell, if he dies the enemy of God, just as it would have had to be paid in purgatory, if he had died in a state of grace. As it is gradually worked off, the suffering of the soul in hell will be proportionately diminished. In this sense there will be for all in hell who have ever made a good confession in the course of their lives, or an act of perfect contrition, a mitigation of their punishment as the temporal debt due is gradually paid.

Whether such accidental mitigation will afford a very appreciable relief, is a matter that depends on the relative amount of suffering involved in the pain of sense, and the pain of loss respectively. There is no doubt whatever that the pain of loss is a far worse torment than the pain of sense. This necessarily follows from the fact that the one is the punishment of an offence directed immediately against a God of infinite holiness, whereas the other is the penalty of sin, in which the outrage of His Divine Majesty is mediate and indirect, in that it consists primarily in a conversion to creatures in preference to God, while the aversion from Him is only the result of the unlawful adherence to creatures. The greater intensity of the pain of loss is very forcibly put by St. John Chrysostom, who says that a thousand gehennas are not equal to the conscious loss of the eternal glory of heaven, and to the misery of hearing from the mouth of Christ the words, "I know you not."<sup>1</sup> So St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> calls the *poena damni* the

<sup>2</sup> St. John Chrysostom, in Cor. Hom. ix., n. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Opusc. i. 175.

principal misery of the lost ; nor can there be any difference of opinion on this point. But this *pain of loss*, the extreme of human wretchedness, as St. Thomas calls it in the same passage, will not be in any way diminished by the paying off of the temporal penalty due ; nay, the subsequent act by which the sinner who had been forgiven and reconciled to God, again wilfully separates himself from Him, has a malice greater than that of any previous sin that had rendered him the enemy of God. We must remember, too, that this mitigation will be confined to the time preceding the day of judgment, and that after that there will be no further question of any temporal punishment whatever. If the sinner experiences a certain relief as the pain due for these forgiven sins diminishes and disappears, he will, on the other hand, anticipate, with a terrible dread, the day of the resurrection, when he will be united to the body in which he sinned, and when, to his shame and confusion, his sins will be manifested before all the world, and when he will writhe under the awful sentence from the mouth of the Judge of living and of dead, that will consign him, body and soul, with the curse of God fresh upon him, to the company of the devils and of the lost for all eternity.

3. The third sense in which we may admit, if we chose, a certain mitigation in hell, is in the punishment due for venial sins. St. Thomas mentions it incidentally in the passage of which we have just spoken, and discusses it at some length in the same work.<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of his supposed adversary is that venial sins have a very limited guilt as compared with mortal, and therefore must also have a limited punishment, which would not be the case if their punishment was an eternal one ; and, moreover, that it would not be just to impose on the sinner a heavier punishment than is imposed on the just for the same sin. To this the saint answers, that as the guilt of those venial sins cannot be remitted in hell, since in hell there is no love of God or friendship with Him, it necessarily follows that the punishment must remain unremitted with the unremitted guilt.

<sup>1</sup> Dist. 21, q. 1, art. 2, q. 3.



The irremissibility of the punishment is due, not to their having in themselves any infinite or unlimited guilt, but to the fact that they are accompanied by mortal sins, which exclude from the pale of forgiveness him to whom they are attached. It is *ratione subjecti* that they receive an eternal punishment, not *ratione sui*, because there is no means by which he who has committed them can be pardoned, not because they are in themselves unpardonable.

In opposition to this opinion, Scotus and the Scotists maintain that there will be a cessation in hell of the suffering due to all venial sin, on account of the punishment due being a temporal, not an eternal punishment. If they are right, and this is a question, the discussion of which would take us too far afield, there is beside the mitigation conceded by all when the temporal punishment due for mortal sins has been paid, a further mitigation for all venial sins of which the guilt still remains at the moment of death. But if the former mitigation is an accidental and limited one, how much more the latter! Like that which will be granted when the temporal punishment of forgiven mortal sins is complete, it will be limited to the time preceding the judgment; and as there is no comparison between mortal and venial sins, so there will be no comparison between the temporal punishment due for each. Hence, while we assert the fact of the mitigation spoken of above, we admit the possibility of this further mitigation; but at the same time regard it as an alleviation not worth the name, in face of the judgment still to come, and the eternal wrath of God.

Now, in considering the various passages in the fathers and theologians of the Church, which are alleged in favour of the theory of mitigation, we must carefully differentiate those which can be satisfied by the admission of one or other of these partial and accidental kinds of mitigation, previously to the day of judgment, from those that involve the notion of a mitigation that is to take place in eternity, after the final sentence has been pronounced by our Lord on good and bad alike. Thus, all passages in which there is any mention of the possibility of the lost deriving benefit from the prayers of their friends, who are still on earth, have

obviously reference to the time preceding the last judgment ; and whatever difficulty they may present on other grounds, are perfectly to be explained by supposing them to refer to the accidental mitigation, which is universally admitted to be a fact. This is, however, only the case where the mitigation is described as a very partial one, and not where there is question of either a total remission, or a substantial alleviation of the penalty. Thus, the oft-quoted passage from St. Augustine (*Enchiridion*, 110), in which he says, that the sacrifices and prayers offered for the dead are for those who are not very bad a propitiation, and profit them either for a complete remission of their pains, or, at least, render their sufferings more tolerable (*ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio*), cannot be referred to the mitigation of which we have been speaking, on account of the alleviation of which he speaks not being limited to a mere accidental or partial one.

The words of the saint are generally explained by theologians (in this following St. Thomas) as referring to the punishment of purgatory, the word *damnatio* being used in its wider and more general sense. It is not easy to determine what was the mind of the holy doctor in the passage in question. There is no doubt that the word *damnatio* is the technical word for eternal, rather than for temporal, punishment. But all such words, like *infernus*, *tartarus*, &c., are sometimes used in a looser sense, and this may be the case here. A recent editor of the *Enchiridion*, F. Faure, inclines to the opinion that the word *damnatio* is here used in its proper sense of the punishment of hell ; but that the saint is here giving the views of those whom he refutes two chapters further on, and that he does not in any way make them his own, or allow that they are tenable. Whichever be the true explanation, we cannot refer them to the kind of mitigation which we are here defending, and which necessarily affords a very partial and limited alleviation to the misery of the lost in hell.

This fact of partial mitigation is of great importance in its bearing on the various passages in the fathers and theological writers, which are quoted as if they were a conclusive argument in favour of the doctrine of an

unlimited mitigation being admissible. The expression of an opinion that occurs from time to time in accredited writers, and is implied in certain prayers, found in missals sanctioned by local authority, that the lost in hell may, perhaps, derive some benefit from the suffrages of the living, is wrongly taken as a proof that there may be a continuous and ever-advancing alleviation of the sufferings of hell; until at length the pain of sense, at least, is in great measure, or altogether, removed, and the condition of the person thus assisted by the charity of friends on earth rendered—not, indeed, one of eternal beatitude, but certainly one that would not deserve the name of hell, in the common acceptation of the word. Indeed, this would necessarily be the result of continued prayers on behalf of any of the lost, supposing them to be sufficiently earnest, numerous, and persevering, if these prayers had the power of bringing relief to the lost as regards the substantial and permanent part of their sufferings. But if we bear in mind this accidental and transitory element in the sufferings of many of them, the words of such writers admit of a very different interpretation. Conscious that, besides the eternal punishment that was due to all the lost, there was also, in many instances, a further debt of temporal punishment to be paid, they imagined, or hoped, that at least they might receive some alleviation of these temporal pains through the intercession of their friends on earth; and that the mitigation to be bestowed upon them when this debt had been worked off might be hastened, if the satisfactory effect of good works and prayers offered by the living were transferred to them.

This is, perhaps, the true explanation of the passage in St. John Chrysostom,<sup>1</sup> in which he says, speaking of those who died in sin: “Let us weep for these; let us help them according to our ability; let us devise some means of assisting them; small, indeed, but still with power to afford them some aid.” For even admitting that he is here speaking of those who died in mortal sin, the small help alluded to might well be the more speedy payment of that debt

<sup>1</sup> Hom. 13 in. ep. ad Philipp.

of temporal suffering that had to be paid before the day of the final judgment. We may, similarly, explain the passage in Theophylact (in Luke xii. 5), in the Pseudo-Athanasius (Quæst. ad Antiochum, 33), and in the letter of Innocent III. to the Archbishop of Lyons, where, however, the Pope simply refuses to express any opinion, and leaves the solution of the question to the discretion and wisdom of the Archbishop. This is, probably, the true explanation of the prayer that is to be found in some Missals sanctioned by local authority, in which the words *ut tolerabiliora fiant ipsa tormenta* occur in reference to the lost; as well as of the traditional doctrine of the schismatic Greeks, which was advocated at the Council of Florence by Mark of Ephesus (the chief opponent of the Filioque clause), and which is said by Leo Allatius to have been allowed by the Latins present at the Council.

Yet these passages, and certain others that may be quoted to the same effect, are not of sufficient number or authority to establish a probable opinion in favour of the practice of offering prayers for those who have died in mortal sin. On the contrary, the universal custom of the Church is to abstain from offering any prayers in their behalf, and there is quite a consensus of theologians against it. St. Gregory the Great says expressly that for those who depart without the grace of God no supplication will be made, either by the Church militant or the Church triumphant. St. Augustine<sup>1</sup> says that "the Church prays not for the evil angels, and for the same reasons prays not for men who are to be tormented in the eternal fire." St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> pronounces the opinion, that our prayers are of advantage to the lost, to be "presumptuous, opposed to the judgment of the saints, without authority, and contrary to reason, inasmuch as they are outside the bond of charity, through which the good works of the living are extended to the dead." Elsewhere he speaks rather less strongly against it,<sup>3</sup> allowing that it may in some sort of way, and in a few exceptional cases, be maintained (*posset aliquomodo sustineri*);

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, xxi. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Suppl.* 71, 5.

<sup>3</sup> *In Lib. iv. Sent. Dist. 15, q. ii., art. 2, q. 4.*



but he sums up by saying that it is safer to say simply that our suffrages do not profit the lost. Suarez goes still further, characterizing as erroneous the opinion in favour of prayers for the lost, and claiming that the opposite doctrine is proximate to faith.<sup>1</sup> To suppose that those who are the enemies of God, and destined so to remain to all eternity, could be benefited by the prayers of the living would be in direct contradiction with the words of Holy Scripture, *In inferno nulla redemptio*, and with their exclusion from the communion of saints.

When, therefore, we say that the scattered passages that we find in favour of prayers for the dead may, and probably do, have reference to the time preceding the judgment when there will be a certain mitigation, we do not mean to say that such mitigation is hastened by the suffrages of the living; but that, even if the opinion in favour of praying for the dead were an admissible one, it would have no possible force as an argument for there being any continuous alleviation of their pains after the day of judgment; but simply for the alleviation, that all theologians admit, of those temporal penalties that must of necessity come to an end when the debt is paid, whether the payment of the debt take place in purgatory or in hell.

Of course we must reject still more absolutely the notion that the lost may sometimes be altogether freed from the agony of their torment in hell by the suffrages of the living. Yet we do not say that by a singular and extraordinary exercise of the power of Almighty God, such a release may not in one or two extraordinary instances have taken place. There is a story in a sermon that is found among the works of St. John Damascene,<sup>2</sup> which relates how the Emperor Trajan was freed from hell by the prayers of St. Gregory. But the story, like others of a similar kind, is probably apocryphal, and even if there be any truth in it, the effect of the prayers of St. Gregory would have been not to transfer him from hell to heaven, but to bring back his soul to his

<sup>1</sup> *In Summ.*, p. 3., Disp. 48, 4, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *De Dormientibus*, sec. 6, *Patr. Gr.* 95, 251.

body for a sufficient time to enable him to make his peace with God.<sup>1</sup> Another explanation of the story, according to St. Thomas, is that Trajan obtained a certain respite until the day of judgment, but not afterwards. This opinion, which is extended by a certain theologian named Praepositivus to all the lost for whom prayers are offered upon earth, is rejected by the Angelic Doctor as quite untenable.

4. We must now pass on to the kind of alleviation which we fancy is generally prominent before the minds of those who advocate the doctrine of mitigation in respect of the sufferings of hell. They allude, not to the accidental mitigation, limited to the time before the judgment, but to some substantial change which will render tolerable that which was before intolerable, and will afford such relief to the lost, that they will, albeit not free from at least a negative punishment, be in a condition that will cause them to appreciate existence as a good, and not to loathe it as an evil, and to hug their chains, and find in hell a certain harmony with their own mental condition. Can we admit the possibility of such a mitigation as this? Or, if we cannot go the length of conceding a mitigation that will render the condition of the lost one in which the suffering ceases to render the existence of those who are subject to it a misery and a curse, can we admit some sort of alleviation of their pains after the day of judgment, either by way of an occasional intermission of their pain of sense, or by a permanent relief; which, while it leaves them to all eternity in a state of severe suffering, nevertheless removes a considerable portion of the torment that they endured when first consigned to the eternal prison-house?

To the first of these questions, we unhesitatingly give a negative answer: indeed, we are compelled to characterize it as approaching very near to heresy. For if there is one fact that is clearly writ on the pages of Holy Scripture, and receives the common consent of all the fathers and theologians of the Church, it is that the sufferings of the wicked will not only be eternal, but that their eternal suffering will be one of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. St. Thomas, in 1<sup>o</sup> 2<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>a</sup>, D. 45, 2, 2. Summ. de M. 4. Vitiu. C. 11. Disp. 43, c. 3. ii. 10.

the most terrible and agonizing character. We are not here expressing any opinion as to whether the fire of hell will be a literal or metaphorical fire;<sup>1</sup> we simply limit ourselves to the assertion that, whatever its character, it will cause insufferable agony to those who are subjected to it, not merely for a certain limited period, but for ever. What else can be the meaning of our Lord's words, that in hell the worm never dies, and the fire never will be extinguished? and by His earnest exhortation to sacrifice even the right hand or the right foot rather than be liable to so terrible an eternity? What else would be the force of His words, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels"? The words of the Judge would be a mockery, if, after a certain time, the curse were to be lifted, and the fire were to withdraw its tormenting power. If hell is the wine-press of the wrath of God (Apoc. xiv. 10); if it is a pool or lake that burns with fire and brimstone (Apoc. xix. 21, xx. 14); if its characteristic employment is to be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 42); if the smoke of the torments of those who dwell there is to go up for ever and ever (Apoc. xiv. 11), it must needs be that these torments last for ever, and that the weeping and gnashing of teeth never ceases, and that the worm will gnaw at the heart, and the fire will continue to inflict its unbearable torment for ever and ever.

There is no need of piling up quotations from Scripture or from the fathers to the same effect. We do not believe that the most zealous theological advocates of the theory of mitigation ever contemplated a mitigation that would cause hell to be no longer the home of misery and of sufferings intolerable. We may, therefore, pass on to the more moderate opinion of those who express a hope that God will in His mercy extend, after a time, such mercy to the lost as shall not indeed render their condition one of contentment or satisfaction, or anything but one of misery and pain; but yet that He will lessen the intensity of their agony, and will soften down the acuteness of their torment.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *The Month*, June, 1893, "Is the Fire of Hell a Material Fire?"

This opinion has no support whatever in the pages of Holy Scripture, unless it be in the words of the Psalmist: "Will God forget to show mercy? or will He, in anger, shut up His mercies?" No one, we imagine, would have thought of applying these words to the lost in hell, if it were not for the passage in St. Augustine, already referred to, in which he discusses the possibility of such application, probably because some of his contemporaries had attached this meaning to the text in question. The saint has been describing the two cities of the world to come, the city of Christ and the city of the devil; the one the home of unending happiness, the other of unending misery. "In vain," he continues, "is the pity that some, nay, very many, express with human affection for the eternal punishment of the damned and the torments that they endure for ever and without intermission, softening down Holy Scripture, and thinking that its words are more terrible than true. For they quote the words: 'God will not forget to show mercy, and in His anger will not shut up His mercies.'" St. Augustine, after expressing it as his own opinion that these words are used of the vessels of mercy, and not of wrath, continues: "Or if they think that these words are applied to all, it does not follow that they should think that the punishment will cease of those of whom we read, 'These shall go into everlasting punishment.' But let them suppose, if they like, that the sufferings of the lost are at certain intervals of time somewhat (*aliquantum v. l. aliquatenus*) mitigated. For in this sense we can understand that God in His anger—that is, while His anger still remains—does not shut up His mercies, not by ending their eternal torments, but by applying or interposing some alleviation of their torments."

On this single passage almost all advocates of a permanent and continuous alleviation, from St. Augustine's time to the present day, have rested their attempt to extend the mercy of God to the lost in hell: not merely as assigning to each and all a punishment lighter than they deserved, but also as commencing with a more severe punishment, which is as time, or rather as eternity, goes on, to be lightened at certain intervals. I have already said that such a mitigation must,



of necessity, stop short of any change that would deprive the sufferings of the lost of their character of torments (*cruciatus*), as such change is in direct contradiction, not only with the teaching of Holy Scripture, but with the Decree of Innocent III., c. *Majores*, which lays down expressly the torments of an eternal hell (*perpetuæ gehennæ cruciatus*) as the lot of the enemies of God.

5. But is a mitigation short of this admissible? Can we believe that the agony will become less intense after a certain period has elapsed? Such an hypothesis is, in the first place, absolutely gratuitous. If there were any sort of truth in it we should find some trace of its existence in Holy Scripture, and in the tradition of the Church. But with the exception of one or two doubtful passages like that of St. Augustine's, that we have just quoted, it is destitute of any kind of foundation. *Quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur*. If all mitigation is ignored save that very partial kind that all admit, and this only extending to the day of judgment, we may be perfectly certain that all else is a mere fancy of those who prefer their own imaginations to the *communis sensus* of all Christian ages. It is, we suppose, founded on a well-intentioned desire to exalt the mercy of Almighty God. But does it really fulfil the task that it proposes to itself? Is there any greater mercy in assigning the lost for a certain time to torment worse than that to which they are to be permanently consigned? What possible ground is there for counting it a mercy on the part of God that He should, after the final sentence has been passed, aggravate the final torments with some additional agony which is to pass away after a time? If the final lot assigned to each is the state to which the justice of God, tempered indeed by mercy, assigns them, what possible advantage can it be to them that, for the first few months, or years, or centuries, they should be tormented with a more intense pain of sense or loss than was to be their final destiny?

6. Last of all, we come to the theory of mitigation which is not to be permanent, but simply a short respite in the punishment of those in hell. Here the *locus classicus* is the passage in Prudentius, who writes, as Beilarmino well remarks,

after the playful manner of a poet. The notion of a boon accruing to captives from the visit of a distinguished stranger, prince or potentate, has always been among the many marks of honour by which his presence and his great dignity is recognised, and a tribute of respect shown to him by those who have care of the sufferers. When Orpheus visits Hades the Roman poet tells us that the wheel of Ixion stood still, and Tityos laughed in spite of himself. This idea is reproduced by the Christian poet by the way of honouring the day when our Lord went down to hell, and when He is said to have delivered from limbo all there detained, and a large number of the suffering souls in purgatory. To extend the same notion to hell, was a poetic fancy, which calls for admiration, perhaps, as a flight of imagination, but is not to be treated as a sober fact on which any argument can be built.

To sum up :—(1) We may admit some sort of mitigation for many in hell during the time that precedes the judgment, as the debt of temporal punishment due for forgiven sins is gradually paid; though the very partial relief will be scarcely appreciable, and will be swallowed up in the terrors of the approaching judgment. (2) We may also admit some possible alleviation during the same period of the pain due for unforgiven venial sin. (3) After the day of judgment there will be no sort of mitigation. To suppose a mitigation that will render the condition of the lost any but a perpetual torment and agony, is against the teaching of Innocent III. Any mitigation at all, however slight, is gratuitously asserted, and has nothing whatever in its favour. It is opposed to the Catholic instinct, and to the general agreement of theologians.

R. F. CLARKE, S.J.

## THE CHURCH ABROAD.—II.

## THE IRISH IN AUSTRALIA.

TO play the rôle of self-constituted censor, or assume the office of fault-finder for the mere pleasure the occupation gives, betrays gross arrogance and contemptible vanity. To the writer it presents few attractions; but if in this and subsequent papers he is forced to say things occasionally that may not altogether be palatable, it is with the assurance that he does so for three cogent reasons:—(a) they are statements of *facts* universally acknowledged here; (b) their remedy is a crying want; (c) the discovering of them to those in whose hands the cure may lie is the discharge of a friendly office, perhaps an obligation, and not the carping of hypercritical cynicism.

With all due respect, and indeed regret, necessity forces me to say that the religious training of the Irish immigrant is not at all equal to his new surroundings, and far short of what is necessary in a Catholic to hold his own amid the wars and clashings of religious opinions around him, and the numerous seductions to apostacy on every side. In this country it may be stated, as a rule, that parents religiously ignorant, except in rare cases, bring up indifferent, if not infidel, families. So, though force of habit and tradition may preserve the first, the second and succeeding generations will suffer sadly for the neglected instruction of the pioneers. This is especially true of scattered districts, where a priest can visit but seldom, and a Catholic school is unknown. On the thorough instruction of an immigrant not only does his own perseverance depend, but also into the account are to be taken the after generations, who must in a great measure look to his zeal and intelligence for their knowledge and constancy. To the ignorance and neglect of one Catholic father the ruin of a multitude may be traced.

A well-instructed Catholic can scarcely be a negligent one, when he sees around him the dangers with which his children are beset. There are in every part of this country families, infidel or Protestant, having on their faces the

bright intelligent birth-mark of their Celtic origin, and most Catholic names. Trace the history of any one of them, and invariably the lapse has one of two origins—a mixed marriage, or a poorly-instructed parent, who also became a negligent one. These are the two principal—it might be said the only—sources of leakage. Not alone is he set up for the saving or the ruin of his own blood, but a centre of light to those around him. The Catholic may be challenged who has lived a number of years here, without having opportunities, not only of defending his religion, its principles and practices, but of helping and enlightening struggling, prejudiced, or earnestly-inquiring minds. To break the crusts of error and prejudice, and lead souls, some way at least, into God's light, is within the power of the humblest. Catholic truth, too, meets Protestant minds here under singularly favourable circumstances. They are not hardened or blasted by continental sacrilege or apostacy lying between them and God's grace like a thick wall. The ties of family tradition, public opinion, or racial hates, do not chain them to the old moorings as at home, or repel them from honest investigation of the Church's claims. The old oaken pew, with its sweet and tender memories reaching back to childhood, the vault containing the centuries of ancestral dust, the circling chain of Protestant families dovetailed and intermarried, the local Protestant traditions, all these have passed away. Long distance from the scene of strife, a constant blending and intercourse, melts anti-Irish prejudices, and with a little knowledge begets warm appreciation of our countrymen's genial natures. Thus it happens that Englishmen, who at home would as soon cut off their right arm as to think of joining an Irish Catholic congregation, and listen to their duties explained in Munster brogue, and face the mockery or the scowls of their friends here, marry Irish wives, and become good zealous Catholics. When to himself you add the ever-multiplying generations destined to bear his name, the non-Catholic elements with which Providence surrounds him, and which, if it is not possible to transmute, it is certainly within his power to alter and to better, the number of souls whose salvation depends on the



properly-instructed mind of a single immigrant, is almost reduced to a definite mathematical problem.

I can fully understand how, in a country where the moral surroundings, the social life, and the literary instincts, are all impregnated with the divine aroma of catholicity, where anti-catholic hostility, in all its truculent insolence, or still more dangerous bland seductiveness; where the constant defensive struggle, nerving to action and sharpening caution; and where, alas! the sad spectacle of apostasy are all happily unknown, how easy it is, under such circumstances, to account for a pastor's blinking vigilance. He is led to forget the fact that a certain portion of his flock is destined, sooner or later, to go forth and be the foundations and apostles, to form off-shoots of the Irish Church, that in expansive width and towering strength are destined to eclipse the parent stem; to fill the noble mission evidently destined by heaven for our race—the world's apostolate, amidst the decay of Catholic, and the materializing of Protestant faith, that they are to be thrown in surroundings far different from those of their Irish homes. The sense of great and confident security for the majority of his flock in the present, is too apt to lull his anxiety about the few in the future.

The pastor's all-important duty of cultivating and enlarging the religious knowledge of his people, is relegated to the school-master and the Sunday school-teacher; his weekly discourses chiefly consist in moral disquisitions and exhortations, very excellent indeed in their way; the sensibilities of his hearers, their fervour and their piety, may be intensified and inflamed, but their intellectual faculties are seldom enriched or enlightened. Young men and women coming here were generally instructed in their Catechism till they were confirmed, and very little trouble it has given them since they arrived at the mature age of ten; the more developed faculties remained unfed. There was no necessity. At one stroke Catholic surroundings, that almost defy a fall, are suddenly cut off, and with a fragmentary recollection of their confirmation knowledge they land here. The scene, indeed, is changed. A sharp as well as a large demand is

suddenly made, not only on their steadfast adhesion to principle, but also their capability of protecting and defending the faith that is in them. From the hot-house of Catholic fervour they are suddenly transplanted and bid strike root amidst the chilling ice-blasts of sceptical, often ribald, infidelity.

Piety, purely emotional, glowing and effervescent, has a poor chance of lasting in such an atmosphere. The cold snar of the sceptic, or the plausible objection of the sophist, soon quenches its fire and cools its ebullitions. The devotion that rests not on the solid bed-rock of knowledge is a feeble gift, ill suited to the questioning spirit of our age and the practical nature of the Australian.

A young immigrant landing here finds himself at once deprived of all his Catholic props and surroundings—a mere atom cast on the dark corrupting mass of infidelity; within him, indeed, is a wondrous power of leavening and transforming those surroundings, but they are charged with grave danger. Perhaps he is thrown amongst workmen who are well primed in all the ordinary objections against the Church and her most sacred truths; for everyone here is a reader and inquirer. His first feelings are of pain and confused shame at his own ignorance. They return to the charge again and again. The acuteness of his first feelings are blunted. Oftentimes this is followed by a negligence in the practices of a church whose teachings he is unable to defend, and whose usages he fails to explain. Then *facilis descensus Averni*. The first shock but opens the conflict; it is his baptism on fire. For the same bitter conflict he must be prepared, no matter in what sphere of life his lot may be cast. His infidel or Protestant friends are not satisfied with quiescence. The genius of error is activity; restlessness is the off-spring of doubt. This restless activity is ministered to from every quarter. The pulpit, whose entire stock-in-trade consists in negation and objection; the scientific infidelity of the novel and review; the social club; the free-thought lecture-hall, with its attractive accessories of rich music and star singers; speakers, brilliant and polished, whose sparkling declamations and power of repartee and jest

is well calculated to catch unthinking applause. These are so many agencies of unrest, till the social atmosphere becomes charged with doubt, objection, and denial. The most sacred truths are canvassed, and every workshop and railway camp is converted into a debating society.

In such an atmosphere the simple, believing, but poorly-instructed Catholic feels himself overwhelmed and crushed. He was never armed for a contest like this. His Protestant friends may, and frequently do, attend Mass; they return and inquire the meaning of, to them, many striking practices—the lighted candles at mid-day, the vestments and ceremonies, the strange dead tongue of the sacred liturgy, and perhaps the doctrine preached. He is dumb. Were it not for the great preserving grace of God, and his loyal, though blind devotion, to his Irish faith, his case would be perilous. Such souls are open targets for every anti-Catholic engine. But in all earnestness it may be asked: Is it right, or is it just, that they should be left to those protective aids alone? Though the great majority preserve the faith, yet even Irish Catholics are not all saints, and the exceptions form a considerable leakage.

Till an Irishman leaves his own land he cannot be fully impressed with the wondrous extent and power of the apostolic mission of his race. The English language is daily becoming the world's volapuck. Into whatever lands its sounds are spreading, on Irish tongues it is the vehicle of faith. All over the new worlds, wherever civilization pierces, as invariably as the church spire is lifted to the heavens, one or many of the thirty-two dialects may be heard around its base. Corrosive infidelity is crumbling, and bringing to ruin every Christian structure around us. A large portion of the broken fragments the Church is absorbing and assimilating; the remainder is slowly but definitely shaping itself into a compact anti-Christian power; and the day is fast approaching when sects shall have melted away, and the two great hostile forces—the Church and unmasked infidelity—shall glare at each other from opposing trenches. In her march of constant warfare and progressive conquest, not only the vanguard, but the rank and file of her army, are

almost exclusively Irish. Across the wreckage of Christian systems, and under the gathering clouds of infidelity—harbingers of fierce struggles in the future—they alone uphold her banners and announce her mission.

If Ireland, then, would prove herself worthy of, and rise to the dignity of her glorious destiny, she will send forth her children well equipped, not for the land they are leaving, but the world they are going into; not with their hands tied by ignorance, but armed *cap-à-pie* to meet the cool searching spirit of an age that worships intellect; and by intellect alone, with the grace of God, must be overcome. Where the opportunities for good are so marvellously abundant, the sin of neglect is deep and accountable. Should she sink below the level of so glorious an occasion, perhaps the prayers of her saints and her constancy in the past may scarcely preserve to her the high destiny of being the world's enlightener and preserver in the future; her candlestick may be removed.

Far different is the energy and preparation insisted on by those under whose eyes the desperate struggle is going on, who witness the fierceness of the fight, and know the issues at stake. A priest looks upon the catechism class of his school as one of his most important cares. He either teaches it personally, or has it well taught under his supervision. He knows that the Church of the future is dependent on the school of to-day. Not only is the primary catechism, but the ceremonies, practices, and principal teachings of the Church are explained, and embedded on the young plastic mind. When he holds stations in the bush, he teaches the catechism as regularly as he says Mass. If the young native is once well instructed, there is little fear of apostacy; he is a wary bird, suspicious, cautious, and by no means easily trapped. The standard for confirmation is high, and the examination searching. The sermons must be essentially *instructive*; the proofs of Catholic dogma in all their convincing splendour, the tearing to pieces of the flimsy shreds of sophistries in vogue in literature and social life. The explanation of the Church's practices, usages, and liturgy, with all their beautiful histories and mystic significance;



these generally take the place of pious exhortations; the people are pleased and comforted, their faith strengthened and confirmed by every new accession to their knowledge; but their hearts must be reached through their reason; and that priest knows little of the genius of his people who appeals to the emotional side of their natures before their intellects are well instructed. Every effort is made to surround the parish church with auxiliary institutions—literary societies, clubs, lecture-rooms, guilds, &c. With all these the most zealous priest finds enough to do to make headway against the ever-pressing current. The thousand and one agencies for infidelity are so powerful—the literature, cast of thought, the social tone and organizations. On the other hand, the scattered Catholic elements, wanting in all the power that comes from cohesiveness, social influence, and great wealth. Yet the grace of God, aided by human energy and a splendid spirit of self-sacrifice, is working wonders, and promises a future for the Church in these lands, even beyond the dreams of the visionary.

I turn now to redeem the pledge made in the February number of the *I. E. RECORD*; viz., to give what help I can to intending priests for the Australian mission, to prepare them for its contingencies and wants.

#### THE MISSIONARY IN AUSTRALIA.

The intending missionary will better understand the requirements of his adopted country, and learn how to meet its exigencies, when a brief sketch is placed before him that may enable him to realise the nature and degree of civilization, Australia has already attained. Still haunting Irish minds is the lingering ghost of an old idea, that social life and habits at the Antipodes are scarcely abreast with the latter end of the nineteenth century. The tendency of this is to lull the student into a sense of false security as to his preparedness, and prevent him from thoroughly grasping the fact, and impressing it on his mind, that he is destined to instruct, organize, and spiritually govern a people rejoicing in all the highest and most progressive forms of modern civilization, with whom education is an enthusiasm, and

who spare neither wealth, energy, nor the fervid buoyancy of young nationhood in its attainment.

Inside the Australian continent there are three universities, which in material structure, completeness of equipment in the recognised ability of their teaching staff, and all that great wealth, taste, and ambition to excel can supply, would not discredit some of the proudest of European nations. A professional chair in an Australian university has come to be a coveted prize by the ablest men of Oxford or Cambridge. When a vacancy does occur, amazing numbers of candidates from the historical institutions of Britain struggle for it. The general wealth and generosity of this land always makes it possible for a young man of marked brilliancy to pursue a university course, and should he prove himself worthy of it, his Alma Mater will reward him with a chair or lectorship. With this and the liberal salaries offered, we secure the intellectual cream of both hemispheres. It, therefore, can scarcely be wondered at that in a comparatively brief period some of our educational centres should have already attained a high prestige. They are national institutions in the highest and widest sense of the term; their influence and utility radiate in all directions; they are brought into touch with the most remote homestead in the bush. Besides Matriculation for those pursuing a course of Law, Medicine, or Arts, there are public examinations, Senior and Junior, which are extending their sphere, and every year exciting greater interest. They are conducted on lines of simple convenience. In any town or village with candidates, a committee is formed, and secretary appointed to supervise the work, and transmit it to the university. In the limited population of one colony, New South Wales, with whose educational machinery the writer is best acquainted, not to speak of those who matriculated, passed the Senior and Civil Service examinations last year, over twenty-one hundred successfully secured passes in the university Junior. Such is the interest taken in these examinations, that the institution, whose name appears not on the list of passes, be it secular grammar school, Catholic convent or college, its

halls will soon be thinned, and its doors must eventually close. This educational enthusiasm has spread through every class. The publication of the pass-list is looked forward to with almost the same anxiety as the result of the Melbourne cup. Small farmers and labourers discuss analytically the triumph or failure of every college with searching scrutiny.

I am glad to say, that on the breast of the educational wave the Catholic body holds a leading place. The numbers passed, and the quality of the passes, are frequently made the theme of eulogy by the public press—not always friendly. A leading Sydney journal some years ago was generous enough to say: “The Church need have no fear for the future in this land, that yearly turns out such swarms of educated men and women, trained and instructed under the eyes of its own priests and sisters.” The writer touched the very nerve-centre of the question. With Home Rule Irish emigration may eventually cease; even now what was once a great stream is reduced to a tiny rivulet. To the young men and women at present educated in our colleges and convents, the Church hopefully looks for the future. Not only are they destined to be the leaders of their people, but they are every day called to step into the shoes of their Irish fathers, and carry onward the banner of progressive conquest. This is essentially a building and pioneer generation, and it is the spirit of heroic sacrifice, of loyal steadfastness, exhibited within the next fifty years, that must give strength, cohesion, tone, and colour to the centuries that are to come.

The vexed problem, so much agitated in Irish journals some years ago, namely, the higher education of women, has been practically solved. The names of even small branch convents may be found on the university books. Instead of unbinging, experience proves that a thorough grinding in higher subjects but steadies and sobers the minds of girls; tones down, if not actually destroys, giddiness or frivolity; while it engenders a habit of close reasoning, determined industry, noble ambition, and, what is better still, expands their view of how much they have yet to learn. Of this educational fever among Catholics, I will but mention one

fact which speaks for itself. New South Wales, with a by no means wealthy Catholic population of less than two hundred and fifty thousand, has seven boarding colleges, one of them counting three hundred boarders. The Protestant portion of the community may excel our people in many things, but for the noblest efforts to give the best education to their children, our kinsmen yield the palm to none. The smallest farmer will drain his last shilling to secure that blessing for his sons and daughters.

This is not the place to discuss the advantages of examinations in general, or the utility or otherwise of high-pressure competition. In every large town so desiring, the university appoints a lecturer to give, during the winter months, a course on some branch of science, history, or philosophy. Nor is the useful neglected. Offshoots from the Technical College, with small well-chosen museums, may be found in every town, where the various practical branches are taught. Geometrical drawing, chemistry, shorthand, typewriting, cooking, geology—so very useful in a mining country—so that the errand-boy and shop-girl in the evenings may perfect themselves in sciences that can open wide the door to ambition. Thus the blessings of a university education are brought to the very doors, and a constant active current is maintained between the remotest parts and our great educational centres. Before leaving this question a small digression may be permitted.

It has struck many here as a sad error that the resolution arrived at by many eminent Irish ecclesiastics when the Royal University was established was not carried into effect; namely, in enforcing an arts degree on every aspirant for the priesthood. Had such a splendid resolve been carried out, the result would be untold strength to the Church in foreign lands. Where the Church has to grapple breast to breast with the secular world, its arm would be immeasurably strengthened by meeting it on its own highest level. Ministers of the Protestant denominations are, as a rule, men with degrees, and it gives them a high standing. The fact that no university has put its seal on the priest's education is often pointed out to Catholic graduates, who are



reminded that in that respect, at least, they stand superior to the man who assumes the office of their teacher. It favours a current Protestant opinion that a priest may know some Latin and Greek, but an educated man he is not; and Catholics constantly mixing in Protestant society cannot fail to have their ideas more or less tinged with strong prevailing notions. But a priesthood with degrees would prove an invaluable practical benefit in another quarter. "The Royal" is affiliated to all our colonial universities. A graduate of the former landing here can be admitted *ad eundem* on Commemoration Day, and his name three years on the books entitles him to vote as a Fellow. Had we a number of priests armed with such effective power in each of the capitals, they would be a certain guarantee that at least the tone and spirit would not be anti-Catholic. The absence of a Catholic check has allowed at least one Australian University to become a hot-bed of aggressive bigotry. Primary education is compulsory. The state takes care that none of its citizens shall grow up ignorant; and negligent parents have the option offered them of sending their children to school, or, in default of a fine, going themselves to jail. The magistrates in general administer the spirit more than the rigid letter of this law, and make *negligent* parents alone suffer.

Passing from the schools to other channels of education, it might be mentioned that every town has its lending-library and reading-rooms, where the best and newest works, with the leading magazines and reviews, may be read for a mere trifle. Newspaper literature is infinite. The capitals boast some of the ablest written journals in the language, one having a larger advertising column than the *London Times*. Every village has a local paper, and the workingman is as certain to have his paper laid on his door-step as his loaf. Hence, the greatest surprise in store for a new arrival is not so much the clean, active, well-dressed population; the huge costly buildings of the cities, or flower-draped verandahs of the tiniest cottage; the wide, scrupulously clean, well-planted streets; the superb cable-trams of Melbourne, or the fairy beauties of Sydney's matchless harbour, as the general

intelligence of all, and the easy confidence with which it is expressed, even by the lower orders, if we have such. On a church committee it not unfrequently happens that the professional man or merchant finds himself side by side with the mechanic or labourer, who form their opinions often with equal accuracy of thought, but certainly express them with the same unreserved freedom.

There are, too, the numerous refining agencies that come in the train of wealth. I shall mention but one. Recent statistics reveal the astounding fact that there is a piano for every eleven persons in Australia. You cannot enter a bark hut, but the first thing you see is a "Werther" or a "Collard." From this it can by no means be inferred that we claim to be a musical country in the sense that Italy or Germany is. The science of musical theory and harmonious combinations is seldom found in a new land where, instead of music in its true sense, oftentimes brilliant noise is applauded. To cultivate the national ear and refine a people's taste, a national school of music and some great names to conjure by are essential, as well as long associations with the artistic and refined. But all this is the work of centuries. Side by side with this passionate struggle for all the greatness that enlightenment can give, are other forces operating to colour and direct the trend of the national mind. That soft, free, open-hearted transparency of character, so peculiarly Irish, and so loving in its confiding simplicity, cannot be expected here. We are essentially a business, progressive, and very earnest people; hence the sharp acuteness of the perceptions.

Among people who differ in nationality, religion, cast of thought and opinion, this open-minded, confiding spirit quickly fades and gives place to wariness and self-contained reserve, which become the settled habit of those whose surroundings from their cradle naturally beget caution. The circumstances of old lands, where generations grow up under the same roof-tree, among the same neighbours and their children, are not known here. But what we lose in poetry, we gain from another side. Constant change of neighbours and acquaintances gives many the advantages of travel

without the toil. The friction and intercourse with men and characters, the combating new opinions, the clashing of divergent and contradictory ideas, whilst enlarging the reason and experience, moderate fixed ideas and open a splendid field for training the faculties and sounding the very depths of human nature.

Those who have followed this bald exposition of a few of the forces at work in the moulding and colouring of Australian national character, elevating its civilization towards knowledge and culture, will be prepared for two conclusions. First, the resultant of various active forces, not to speak of others, is to leave a distinct impress on the nature, mind, and temperament. The second, the man preparing to labour in such a community requires a very elaborate training, specially suited to the exigencies of his future life. I shall endeavour to briefly sketch the first, and the full development of the latter must be reserved for the next article. The native perception is clear and astute, his caution sharp; his own temperament under perfect mastery and control; no matter how his heart throbs or his brain burns, his face will seldom betray him. It takes a very clever man to read him through. Quick to discover the motives of others, and fearless to give his opinion in disapproval or applause. Devoid of sentiment or emotion, essentially an intellectual being; his convictions must first be satisfied before his heart can be moved; easily led by reason, and as ductile as wax when reason and kindness blend; but for bullying and bluster he reserves his proudest scorn. Every priest must be prepared for a keen, free, if respectful, criticism. People speak their minds freely, and will not leave him long in ignorance of their opinion. There is no dignity to hedge anyone here—the clear, cold searching light pierces everywhere. To the priest who zealously works and shows himself true to his high vocation, they will cling as true as steel; nay, more, a priest who rises above the ordinary level by culture, learning, or eloquence, is their idol and constant boast. The serious problem of twenty years ago was—When the Irish element dies out what kind of congregations will native Catholics form? Time has solved

that question, and the Church in these lands has nothing to fear for the future. When twelve years ago a great crisis came in our educational system--when we were flung back on our own unaided efforts to build and maintain our own schools, or let the rising generation drift into the godless public schools, so justly stigmatized as "hot-beds of immorality and seed-plots of infidelity," it demanded an heroic sacrificial spirit springing from deep faith. The Catholic body, native and Irish, stood shoulder to shoulder and responded in a manner equal to the emergency and worthy of the great issue at stake. By natural process the Irish element is disappearing, and the native is ever on the increase; yet in the constant stretch of effort no slackening of determination is evident. Our schools are building, convents opening, and churches erecting with a rapidity and at an expenditure of sacrifice on the part of the people simply amazing.

Let it be repeated, there is no need of fear for a purely Australian church; but the man assuming the office of teacher of the young native must be fashioned from the best of steel and prepared with the brightest polish. In secular learning and general knowledge he must stand as high, if not higher, than the very best amongst them; confident in the security of that level when he points upwards and cries "Excelsior," they will follow with as much alacrity and willing obedience as any people on earth.

MICHAEL PHILAN.



## THE MYSTICAL SENSE OF SCRIPTURE.—IV.

IN the July number of the I. E. RECORD, 1892, some remarks were made on the interdependence of the Old and the New Testament: then the great principle was established that the latter is the key to the inner meaning of the former; and lastly, the mystical sense of Osee xi. 1 was accordingly explained by means of St. Matthew ii. 15.

This article and some of the subsequent ones will contain further exemplification of the same fundamental axiom of exegesis, and further evidence of that truth on which the axiom itself rests; viz., that the Law and the Gospel are respectively type and antitype. “Adstipulantur enim sibi invicem utriusque foederis paginae,” as St. Leo says. To proceed. The next instance of this reciprocal relation that the same Evangelist points out, is told in words familiar to us all: “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremias the prophet, saying: A voice in Rama was heard, lamentation and great mourning; Rachel bewailing her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.” (ii. 18.) Here we are told, as we shall find on examination, that the destruction of the kingdom of Juda, predicted by Jeremias, xxxi. 15, and there rhetorically described by the exquisite figure of Rachel weeping over her dead children, was a type of the murder of the Holy Innocents. The catastrophe of Rama foreshadowed that of Bethlehem.

26. Grammatical remarks upon certain parts of the passage as *quoted* (with perhaps one exception—namely, that the use of the participle “bewailing,” instead of the finite verb “bewailed,” may be an instance of an Aramaism frequently met with—see Beelen, Moulton’s Winer, &c.) would not enable us better to understand the subject of the passage, *i.e.*, the immediate subject of the passage in the prophet, because St. Matthew reproduces neither the Hebrew text nor its Greek version literally, but gives mainly in his own words the substance of Jeremias xxxi. 15.

However, the beautiful parallelism<sup>1</sup> of the original, which almost disappears in the Septuagint is restored in the Gospel, where, on the other hand, some words of that version are adopted. The Evangelist shows (as Schanz remarks, *Comm.*, page 110, where the verbal coincidences, &c., are accurately and fully treated) his perfect acquaintance with both text and translation, and his perfect liberty to use now one, now the other, just as he thinks fit, where the unemployed "Bible" would have served his purpose equally well. This was long ago observed by St. Jerome:—"Hoc Hieremie testimonium Matthæus non secundum Hebraicam veritatem, nec juxta 70 protulit. Ex quo perspicuum est evangelistas et apostolos non interpretationem alicujus secutos; sed tanquam Hebræos homines quod legebant

<sup>1</sup> "A voice in Rama was heard,  
Lamentation and bitter weeping,  
Rachel weeping for her sons,  
Refusing to be comforted for her sons, because they are dead."

In this quatrain, each of the two couplets is in what is known as synthetic or cognate parallelism—the second line in each advancing on the first. Compare in Hebrew, Ps. i. 1, xix. 8-10 (Vulg. xviii.), lv. 7-9, (Vulg. liv. 7, 8), lxxvii. 18, 19 (Vulg. lxxvi.); moreover, there is a parallel connection here between the first and third line, the second and fourth line.

The above is an exact translation of the Hebrew, as it is printed in the best editions; in the second line, "bitter weeping" is literally "weeping of bitterness," a Hebrew idiom of frequent occurrence; in the fourth, "are dead" is literally "are not," or rather "they not." The phrase is often used of those that are really dead, or reputed as such. Thus the patriarch Jacob uses it about Joseph, Gen. xlii. 36: "Joseph non est super," Vulg.; and Job about himself, vii. 21: "Non subsistam," Vulg., where see also Jer. xlix. 10, Ps. lviii. 14, &c. We must bear in mind, that the "Seventy" and St. Matthew wrote for Jews, to whom this idiom could not be made more intelligible. It was for them a household word, but for us it must be translated. Readers of Livy, Homer, &c., will, however, recollect it. It is explained by "mortui sunt" in Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v., but not in the excellent edition of his *Lexicon*, Clarendon Press, 1891.

In the same fourth line, "for her sons" is of doubtful authenticity; hence it is bracketed here—it it does not belong to the Hebrew text, then the text agrees with St. Matthew. The Septuagint has "for her sons" only once, but then the Septuagint reads thus: "A voice in Rama was heard of lamentation and of weeping and of wailing; Rachel weeping would not cease for her sons, because they are not," ed. Tischendorf.

As is well known, St. Matthew wrote in Aramaic or late Hebrew, but the work was soon lost sight of, and its Greek translation is ever since practically looked on as if it were the original. The remarks, then, in the text above are to be understood in accordance with the actual state of things. The writer speaks of the Gospel of St. Matthew as we have it.

Hebraice, suis sermonibus expressisse." It is necessary to direct attention to this, for some commentators, who by their theory of accommodation would have allowed the Evangelist to alter the sense of a quotation, might be loath to grant him liberty to change a word. When we speak thus of St. Matthew, it is obviously meant that he acted so in virtue of inspiration, and we may add that the freedom with which the words of the Old Testament are quoted in the New, is not without deep significance, nor without its due influence on the Church in the use which she makes of Scripture.

27. Neither would grammatical remarks be of direct assistance when we come to read the passage in the prophet Jeremias. The mystical sense is found not in what an inspired writer *says*, but in what he *speaks of*. We shall therefore put philology aside, and give all our attention to the subject-matter of xxxi. 15. It is rather obscure. And at the outset it must be observed that it is of the utmost importance here to discriminate between the plain fact and its rhetorical representation, between the historical event mentioned above and the poetic imagery with which that awful reality is veiled by the most pensive and subjective of all the inspired writers. The fact is simply this—the Jews were finally conquered, and Jerusalem their holy city was taken by Nabuchodonozor, B.C. 536; shortly afterwards the captivity of Babylon commenced; and thus ended the kingdom of Juda. Jeremias foretold it; to us it is a matter of history. To recognise it as it appears in the verse (xxxi. 15) which we are studying, one must bear the following remarks in mind. Jeremias was of a highly poetical temperament, in which vivid imagination was combined with the tenderest pathos, and full of love for his own nation and country, the people of God, and the Holy Land: natural gifts which were immeasurably increased by being supernaturally moved and guided by Him who is All-beautiful and All-merciful. Inspiration did not destroy, it exalted nature, and made of all that was noblest in Jeremias a divine instrument, so that the prophet became the mouth-piece of God. While the Almighty spoke, the words were all

His own, they were also all man's—more the work of God than of man, for the One was the principal, the other the subordinate cause. Such is the Catholic idea of inspiration; and its premiss, this all-important truth is employed in countless passages by St. Thomas; it is, in fact, one of the principles which form the basis of the *Summa*, and it may be seen exemplified in its fullest application (to our Lord's sacred humanity) 3<sup>a</sup> p. q. xix., art. 1, ad 2. Hence no one need be surprised at its being used here, for without it we could not discern and separate what is poetic and subjective from that on which the mystical sense of the passage rests. The saddest of all human subjects sought and received a fitting description from the saddest of all the Hebrew prophets. The captivity, as it draws near, makes his book more and more mournful; till at length it comes, and then the climax is reached in the Lamentations.

28. The captivity of Babylon was still future when our verse was written; it was to be the punishment of the persistent incredulity and obstinacy of the Jews. Jeremias had repeatedly warned the two tribes of Juda and Benjamin, the remnant of his people; but his warnings were in vain; he prophesied, but they turned a deaf ear to his words. Even the Assyrian captivity had no lesson for them. Three times in the preceding chapter (xxx. 5, 12, 23) he foretold the fast-approaching doom, he does so once more here (xxxi. 15), but in a higher strain, and with words of encouragement in the following verse (16).<sup>1</sup>

(This verse is, of course, not quoted by St. Matthew, as it does not refer to his subject, the massacre of the Innocents; nor will it be at length explained here, since in this place only passages of the Old Testament quoted in the New are treated of. Suffice it to say, that it proves our explanation of xxxi. 15 to be correct, for it means the return from Babylon, and has itself a mystical sense. It refers mediately to an event in the New Testament. Some Jews, at least, believed in Jesus Christ, just as some returned from Babylon. (See Schanz, Knabenbauer, &c.) It is enough for our present purpose to observe that it is indirectly a prophecy about our Saviour. Students of Scripture know well the value of the formula, "Thus saith the Lord;" prefixed to a particular prophecy, as it is here, for it marks the announcement as of special importance; and well they know too that the gloomiest predictions are generally compensated for by a fresh promise of the Redeemer. As the hard quartz shows the miner that gold is at hand, so after a presage of woe, practised commentators, as they tell us, instinctively look out for a Messianic prophecy. Though the Jews



He represents Rachel, the mother of Juda and Benjamin, as wailing aloud in her tomb when the two tribes, descended from and called after them, were being led into captivity. She appears in this fourth prophecy for the first time, when the whole extent of the calamity comes into view as the veil of the distant future is withdrawn, and the mystical meaning is perceptible. As we shall presently show, something in respect of the Messias, a still greater evil than the captivity of Babylon was to befall her descendants. Rachel's tomb (called at present Kubbet Rachil) was near Bethlehem, but her piercing cries could be heard more than nine miles off at Rama. A glance at the map will show that Rachel's tomb is S.E., and Rama N.E. of Jerusalem, and that Jerusalem lies halfway between them. Rama is mentioned in the prophecy, because the Jewish prisoners were to be kept there previous to their departure for Babylon. (See Jeremias xl. 1.) Trochon says it is because Rama, a town in the territory of Benjamin, was on the frontier of Juda; but Rama was not on the frontier, and even if it were, the reason above given would appear to be the only true one. Sanctius, Menochius, Knabenbauer, Steenkiste, Schanz (who calls Rama, Nabuchodonozor's headquarters), Hitzig, Delitzsch, Mansell, &c. (*Speaker's Bible.*)

The town stood on an eminence 2,600 feet above sea level; hence its name (Rama = high); and as a proper name it is correctly preserved in the Septuagint, which, it may be observed, is of especially great authority on Jeremias. Two MSS. (Alexandrine, Sinaitic \*), however, have *εν τη υψηλη*, as if Rama were an adjective here. St. Jerome too translated the word by "*excelso*" (Jer. xxxi. 15), but in the Gospel where he only revised the Vetus Itala or Old Latin Version he allowed the word to remain. Hence the verbal discrepancy between the two places in our Vulgate, Jer. xxxi. 15 and St. Mark ii. 15.

had made their captivity inevitable, yet mercy tempers justice, and when the last of the nation had fallen into the lowest depths of misery, then is the time for divine compassion, and through the thickening clouds comes a ray of heavenly light; not, however, only to the Jews as such, but to the whole world. The temporal calamity and the relief, the captivity of Babylon, and the return affected the people of Israel; but what they respectively typified—sin and redemption—concerned the human race.

The Evangelist writing in Aramaic, of course, wrote רמה, pr. "Rama."

29. Enough has now been said on the Old Testament history to enable readers to understand its deeper meaning as disclosed by St. Matthew. Not Rachel's imaginary weeping, but Juda's ruin, was the *type*, and it symbolized the spiritual rejection of the Jewish people, the punishment of that attempt to slay the infant Saviour which resulted in the massacre of the holy Innocents. Some who have not penetrated beneath the surface, who have not understood the hidden meaning of the prophet's words, fancy that they refer literally to the children of Bethlehem; others go to the opposite extreme, and because nothing in the context justifies the first interpretation, imagine that St. Matthew *accommodated* them. These people forget the infinite truthfulness and accuracy connected with inspiration. We may put aside Rationalists and writers of little or no authority—and as it would be tedious and unprofitable to collect the explanations of all those qualified to speak on the matter, who have held one or other opinion, so it need only be said that great names are quoted for both. For instance, A Lapidé holds the first referring to Theodoret, Hugo, Lyranus, and Vatablus), and says (against St. Jerome, Rabanus Maurus, St. Thomas, &c.) that the passage cannot have been written in its literal sense about the captivity of Babylon, but that Rachel is put by metonymy for the Bethlemite mothers. Patrizi too holds that it is literally about the Innocents. On the other side, we find, more or less, Jansenius Gandavensis, Lamy, Calmet, Natalis Alexander, Alford, &c., and Maldonatus.<sup>1</sup> The poet's advice, "In medio tutissimus

<sup>1</sup> He says, it is true, "Mattheus ad eadem infantium accommodavit;" but his use of "accommodavit" is peculiar. An evangelist may "accommodate" what he quotes in its "mystical sense;" for instance, as we saw in the last article (I. E. RECORD, July, 1892, page 616, note, where the ambiguity is discussed), Osee xi. 1, is thus applied. So here too in his commentary he says that Jeremias is quoted just as Osee was; and in his commentary on Jeremias (xxx. 15) he says: "Hebraei interpretantur de abductione quantum tribuum in captivitatem, Juda et Benjamin, etc. Quae interpretatio non est Evangelio contraria. Non enim novum est, ut quod historice in veteri testamento de una re dictum est, mystice de alia re interpretentur Evangelistae. Osee dixit ut de populo Israelitico, Matthaeus

ibis," is particularly applicable here : the verse refers literally to the captivity of Babylon, and mystically to the massacre of Bethlehem ; so, Beelen, in note to his Flemish version, Fillion, Steenkiste, Schanz, Knabenbauer, and many others. It will be well to quote the paragraph with which the last-named commentator concludes his explanation of Jeremias xxxi. 15 :—

“ Quomodo ex sensu apud Jeremiam illa consequatur argumentatio qua utitur S. Matthaeus (ii. 18) paucis innuere sufficiet hoc loco. Adverte igitur exhiberi dolorem Rachel apud Jeremiam de populi interitu et rejectione a Deo ; eandem adesse doloris rationem cum Messias a rege quocum tota urbs Jerusalem turbata est ad necem quacsitus fugere debeat ; populus enim salutem Messianicam repudiatus seipsum interitui mancipat. Haec autem rejectio Messiae affert populi destructionem, ejus autem destructionis qua populus in seipsum fuit praeludium et praesagium est caedes puerorum Bethlehemiticorum et luctus et ploratus matrum. Quod si perpenderis, neque dices, Jeremiam litteraliter de caede illa Bethlehemitica vaticinari—id quod a contextu recedit—neque Matthaeum sola uti accomodatione—id quod ab argumentationis ratione pariter alienum est.”

30. The prominence given to Rachel seems to be the reason why some persons have regarded the whole portrayal as purely imaginative. The higher light in which the central figure stands has so dazzled their mental vision, that they cannot see the wide background of reality. If what Jeremias presents to us is an allegorical picture in one part, it is none the less historical in every other, and to judge of it we must view it from the proper standpoint ; we must put ourselves in that position which Jeremias would have us to occupy. To his own contemporaries, those for whom in the first instance the work was executed, this was natural ; but it is not so easy for us ; it requires attention.

Rachel is introduced, on account of that love of children which characterises her (Gen. xxx.), into the description of

mystice accomodavit ad Christum, sexcentaque sunt exempla generis ejusdem.” The reader will find another instance of this ambiguity in his commentary on St. Matthew iii. 1, when compared with his remark on iii. 3. This equivocal use of technical words by the great commentator is surprising, and sometimes leaves us in uncertainty about his real meaning. Here, however, he rejects the mystical explanation, as Knabenbauer also remarks.

what was to take place about eleven hundred years after her death, at the dark epoch when as far as human foresight could reach, the end of Rachel's descendants as a people appeared inevitable. " Ephraim " or " Israel " was gone, and now " Judah " was about to follow. Assyria was the grave, it seemed, of one; and Babylon would, doubtless, be the grave of the other. The death of her children is one of the bitterest sorrows a mother can feel; what would it not then be to Rachel, who was the personification of maternal love? In the inspired poet's vision she rises from her tomb to weep. She cannot rest, for she is the mother of Joseph (Ephraim and Manasses) and of Benjamin; so in both kingdoms her descendants were to be found. Hence the opinion of St. Jerome, Calmet, Scholz, Trochon, &c., that she weeps only for the kingdom of Israel, ended by the Assyrian captivity, is not so well founded as that of St. Epiphanius, Sa, Sanctus, Maldonatus, &c.; namely, that while she laments it, she laments still more the final ruin of her race—the termination of the kingdom of Juda by the captivity of Babylon. As Knabenbauer points out, Israel and Juda are jointly mentioned in this particular prophecy, xxx., xxxi. See xxx. 3 (both together); if there is a special promise to Israel in xxxi. 1, 4, 6, 9, it is in connection with Sion, xxxi. 6-12. If the return of Israel is predicted 18-20, so is that of Judah, 23, 24. And the fulfilment of both prophecies is recorded in the same verse, 1 Par. ix. 3.

31. Inadvertence to all this historical truth may have been the cause, or one of the causes, which led some to hold the opinion that the verse was quoted by St. Matthew in an accommodated sense: that in the Gospel there was only an allusion, beautiful indeed in itself, but still a mere figure of speech; that as the prophet employed *prosopopœia*, so the Evangelist, to put it respectfully, used a metaphor. They lay all the stress on the *ideal* part, and then ask triumphantly whether this could be the foundation of a mystical sense? We answer in the negative; but we never even implied that it was. One of the three inseparable qualities of every type is *reality*. All our readers may see that while the ideal or subjective element in the words of Jeremiah



has been fully recognised and admitted, care was taken to show it was exclusively for the real event, *i.e.*, the end of the kingdom or of the visible theocracy, that we claimed a typical meaning. On the erroneous assumption that Rachel's weeping (a mere poetic image) is the type or prophecy "to be fulfilled," so many insuperable difficulties would arise that, in despair of being able to give a satisfactory solution, the relevancy of Jeremias' utterance to the Holy Innocents, and St. Matthew's right to quote it as prophecy, will be virtually denied. The necessary postulate for such interpretation is, of course, the enfeebling of the formula, "then was fulfilled," *τοτε επληρωθη*, or its counterpart, "that it might be fulfilled," *να πληρωθη* (Dathe, who is followed by Marshall, would make a difference between them to the detriment of the former; but he has been refuted by Anger—*De ratione qua V. T. in N. T. laudatur*), and the consequent admission of the ecbatic theory. And the necessary result is that some of the most important passages in the New Testament (many containing Messianic prophecies, or evidences that the son of the Blessed Virgin Mary was the Son of God) would simply be explained away. This baneful theory of "accommodation," or allusion, found its clearest expression in the words of Isenbiehl, and its fitting condemnation in those of Pius VI. It matters not that some otherwise respectable commentators have held it; for instance, Bonfrerius and Frassenius, because consistently with it they held erroneous opinions about inspiration. The third proposition of Lessius, "*Liber aliquis (qualis forte est secundus Machabaeorum) humana industria sine assistentia Spiritus Sancti scriptus, si Spiritus Sanctus postea testetur, ibi nihil esse falsum, efficitur Scriptura sacra,*" or the doctrine of "subsequent inspiration," was fully developed and scientifically formulated by the former, and implicitly admitted by the latter. (On the whole subject, see Perrone, Kleutgen, Franzelin, Franz Schmid, and Dausch.) The cognate theory of ecbaticism (it differs only in name from that of "accommodation") is not new; it seems to have flourished whenever theology was at a low ebb. Photius was well acquainted with

it.<sup>1</sup> Again and again have theologians protested against it ; for instance, Arizzarra, O.P., says :—

“ Verum si prolata in N. T. admitteretur fuisse usurpata ab Evangelistis aliisque sacris scriptoribus interdum sensu accomodatitio, sequeretur saepe ignorare nos, ubi producantur in sensu a Spiritu Sancto intento. Observandum est etiam uti Evangelistas hac vel simili forma, *ut adimpleretur, impletum est, prophetavit*, etc., qui quidem loquendi modus accommodatitiam sententiam excludit, alioquin vel quasi inutiliter loquuti fuissent, vel etiam protulissent mendacium aiendo impletum esse, quod neque mente neque scripto sacer auctor esset vaticinatus. Addi etiam potest, si sensus huiusmodi, ut supra constituimus, alienus est a scopo et mente Spiritus Sancti Evangelistae proprio arbitratu eam verborum relationem proposuissent, quod absurdum omnino est, cum si nonnulla ab Evangelistis putaremus dicta humano consilio, mutaret illorum auctoritas.” (*Elementa S. Hermeneuticæ, Mutinis, 1790.*)

In the last century and in the beginning of this, men whose theological education was imperfect, like Jahn, &c., may have held it ; but at present it seems to be fast disappearing from the exegetical works of Catholics, though now and then voices are raised in its favour. It appears to have been an unconscious attempt to meet Rationalism half way, or to combat it while adopting some of its principles ; and like all such compromises, it has failed. Its defenders could have been disabused even by the learned Protestants that would have nothing to do with such a method. Let us listen to Glassius, one of their earliest writers on hermeneutics, whose work has ever been held in deservedly high esteem :—“ Cur enim Scriptores sacri in N. T. citant Mosis et prophetarum ex V. T. verba ? Certe ob hanc causam ut fidem suis scriptis faciant. At quam fidem facient, si mala fide usurpent auctorum dicta ? si intentionem vel sensum eorum aut torquent, aut quod pejus est pervertant. Adde, quod ipsi profitentur plerumque, se illos testes citare, et factum esse illud, quod illi quondam vaticinati erant.” It is enough to see its ultimate consequences among those outside the Church. At present, in Germany, Rationalism has reached its end ; it has been logically carried to its furthest limits : one hears now very little in defence of

<sup>1</sup> See his *Life*, by Card. Hergenroether, iii. 291.

the various systems of accommodation, the Heidelberg, the Tübingen, the New Tübingen, &c., that were in vogue some years ago. Wellhausen and his school discard "accommodation" as a puerility, and smile at the antiquated notion that there is a connection between the Old and New Testaments. The prevalent theory at present is that the "prophecies" were written after the O. T. event. Thus facts leave no doubt regarding the tendencies of a theory.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We must ever keep in mind the mysteriousness of Scripture—its immeasurable extent and unfathomable depths. Assent to this truth is the first principle of Catholic exegesis, and its practical recognition is the first step towards learning anything about that for which inspiration was given. The inscrutable character of the written word is an immediate consequence of its divine authorship. St. Peter teaches us our duty, and the reason of it thus: "Understanding this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation" *πασα προφητεία γραφῆς ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως; ου γίνεται* = "no prophecy in Scripture is a subject for private interpretation." *γενομαι*, with a genitive, means to belong to. See Luke xx. 14, 33; Apoc. xi. 15.) The Latin ablative is often the equivalent of the Greek genitive, but it could not be so here. Hence "*propria interpretatione non fit.*" Vulg. is a *literal* translation; the meaning would be expressed in Latin by "*proprie interpretationis non est.*" "For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time; but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost." (2 Ep. i. 20, 21.) How could we dare to try to sound these depths with the tiny intelligence of man? St. Matthew tells us the meaning of a certain text; surely, then, it is our duty to be thankful for his infallible explanation, and to believe it. The obscurity of Scripture is found to be greatest in its mystical sense, for this sense can belong only to God, and to succeed in understanding it, we need special help. We may afterwards, with all reverence, set ourselves to ponder the inspired solution of a difficulty, and to consider the intimate relation thus revealed between events far apart in history, which to man's uninformed mind, even if he chanced to think about them both, would appear unconnected and totally independent of each other. Not, indeed, that any result of our study will make the solution more certain, but that it will make us understand it better. We cannot be of any assistance to St. Matthew, but we can and ought to help ourselves. The Evangelist's *τοτε ἐπληρώθη* is a sufficient guarantee, or rather an ultimatum.

To illustrate this by its converse, although an example can do so but faintly and inadequately. When able writers who are masters of their subject point out historical parallels, or great historians trace events to their true causes, in such hands history becomes almost a science, and the intuitions of genius and learning reaching far into depths unseen by the ordinary student or the general reader, become what may be called human revelation. Let us suppose that the analysis of events has been conducted with all the requisite knowledge, with all the careful scrutiny necessary to discover the truth, and with absolute veracity and impartiality, so far as man can judge—in a word, that nothing that could ensure accuracy appears to be wanting, then this philosophy of history is morally certain, its conclusions become current and are repeated by thousands who are



32. We may now sum up the results. Jeremias' words contain a double prophecy: one to be fulfilled in Rama, the other in Bethlehem. The context forbids the attempt to apply the words literally to the Holy Innocents. There was no risk of making such a mistake on the part of St. Matthew's first readers, for they knew Rama and its history too well. On the other hand, we must keep clear of the accommodation theory, for the first requirement of a Scriptural type, *reality*,

justified in accepting them on the supposed fulfilment of the above conditions. Who is the man who would get a hearing, if he called them in question? Yet it is conceivable that he should be right, and all the others wrong, for without anyone's fault some of the conditions might not have been fully complied with. We have been supposing a possible case; taking the work of the human intellect as it is, the antecedent probability of error in such matters is too often confirmed by experiment, "the philosophy of history" has made many serious mistakes up to the present, and it is not destined to acquire infallibility in the future.

But for St. Matthew the Church demands unqualified and unhesitating belief—he is the inspired interpreter of inspired history. If there remains at times a certain obscurity, let us remember that this is the *sine qua non* of faith. At present we see only in a mirror. When man attempts to eliminate the incomprehensible from Scripture, to drag divine things down to his own low level, to make himself the standard of the possible and impossible, the arbiter of truth and untruth, he becomes *ipso facto* a Rationalist. If, notwithstanding the labours of great Catholic commentators, and all their legitimate efforts, a difficulty still remains, is it not better for us to acknowledge that there is a difficulty, and to rest content with the acknowledgment. Otherwise obscure passages such as the present one, applying what would seem a far-fetched description, yet stating that it is the proper and true one, would be to us so many pitfalls. Luke vii. 14, quoted in St. Matthew i. 28, was a pitfall to Isenbiehl. The present writer is fully aware of the difficulties which beset the path of him who tries to prove that not one of the passages where we find the formula *en propheta* is quoted in an accommodated sense. However, he holds that all these difficulties can be surmounted, and he will endeavour to show how it may be done in those texts which fathers and commentators consider to have a mystified sense. If some subjective or other difficulties still remain, they must be called by their proper name—so many instances of the inherent mytfulness of Holy Scripture; they must not be twisted into evidence for the accommodation theory, or turned into arguments to prove that the tele interpretation was wrong, and that the echaie would be right. (In this respect the most difficult passage in the New Testament will be considered in the next article.) There can be no question about the principle; but if a person fails to see its application in one or two instances (which the writer does not affirm), then let him in justice ascribe this either to some great obscurity there, or to some inability in himself. If the tele theory has its difficulties, it is, at all events, based on the manner in which facts are stated in the Gospel, and on the traditional interpretation. For instance, starting with the principle, "Verba S. Scripturae accipienda sunt prout sonant;" it takes St. Matthew as the guide to show the meaning of



makes it impossible that in the imaginary weeping of an imaginary *rediviva* any mystical sense could exist. We must look for it in its own place, that is, in the fact of sacred history. It can be found only where it is, namely, in the destruction of the kingdom of Juda.

The Holy Innocents could not have been mystically designated, but for their intimate connection with Christ. He is the Antitype of all types: whatever is typically prefigured, be it for weal or woe, is so solely on account of the relation in which it stands towards Him. Their death, considered in itself, could have been *symbolized* (Scripture contains many such representations, Ezechiel and other prophetic books abound in instances of symbolical action referring to human affairs: it comes under the literal sense: and man of himself can employ it), but not *typified*. Words

Jeremias, and as many fathers and commentators as it can get as guides to show the meaning of St. Matthew. There are texts which no Catholic would dream of explaining except by the *telic* interpretation: then why should he not be consistent, and keep to it even in texts which for other reasons are hard to understand?

But readers are not to imagine that there are no difficulties on the other side—there are indeed many; and those insurmountable, as Isenbiehl learned to his cost. The difference between the two sides is this—the difficulties there show *positively* that his system is wrong; the difficulties here show *negatively* that ours is right. A great truth in theology must have its preliminary difficulties. No proposed solution of a great problem that hopes to obtain the attention of competent judges can totally dispense with them. They are, indeed, so much indirect testimony to its worth, and the victory of truth is won only by recognising and removing them. What is not a solution may glory in their seeming absence, and it may by some people for that reason be looked on as true at first sight; but for that very reason it is only a semblance. Such an explanation must be either superficial or erroneous. If it does anything, it must run counter to some truth, all the more fundamental, perhaps, in proportion to the work which is necessary to show why between it and the proffered explanation a collision has occurred.

A theory founded on orthodox principles, and developed after a deep study of Holy Writ, has nothing to fear, if it is consistent with them and coherent in itself; and should it happen that on the part of some persons there are difficulties attendant on its acceptance, that only shows how much will have been learned when it is understood, what progress will have been made when it is assimilated and becomes a part of their mental constitution. All such difficulties are not objective, but subjective.

The writer would by no means imply that the few who hold the “*ecbatic*” sense speak in direct opposition to orthodox interpretation, as Isenbiehl did in his “*accommodation*”; much less that they contradict any authoritative teaching; but he means that they are bound before all else

are to things as man is to God, and conversely. Hence the *real* or mystical sense of Scripture is God's own language, and He speaks it only of Himself. The mystical sense of Scripture is like sacrifice (*nota in re*), it belongs to God alone: when His saints are honoured with it, they are honoured relatively.

33. The next instance does not require so much explanation. "For this is he that was spoken of by Isaias the prophet, saying: A voice of one crying in the desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight His paths" (St. Matthew iii. 3; Isaias xl. 3), is a comparatively easy passage. It presents but one obstacle, and one of the principles we employed above will, it is hoped, enable us to remove it. Everyone knows it refers to St. John the

to see whether their theory is in accordance with the principles and practice of the great Catholic interpreters: and he confesses that he is one of the many who fear that it is at variance. How can they fancy that Old Testament passages, which have no bearing on a subject, could in the New Testament be applied to it, and that the Author of Scripture could say that His words mean what they do not mean? To this, of course, the staple answer is, that in the New Testament such texts are not said to be prophecies of what they are there referred to—in reality they mean something else; but it is so like the New Testament event, that when the event occurred, St. Matthew, &c. (ecbatic interpreters in their reply are careful to keep the divine Author out of sight) were justified in calling it a fulfilment of the prophecy: or, again, that the New Testament event did not take place in order to verify the Old Testament prediction, but that it answered the purpose just as well as if it did. One of these writers thus expresses himself:—"*Ut propheta non semper ad amussim literæ accipitur, ac si res prænuntiata ratio esset eorum, quæ acciderunt: sive res quæ accidit recte inde sequatur ex his quæ prædicta sunt. Sæpe enim perinde valet ac: Qua in re oraculi veritas astruitur. Seu potius. Tunc.*" What is this but a mere subterfuge? How could it verify the prophecy, unless God intended it to verify? As if in what He Himself did, or permitted to be done, during His mortal life, our Lord did not intend the fulfilment of His own pledged word, but did solely what corresponded externally and accidentally to it. If, however, those who hold the ecbatic or accommodation theories mean that the Evangelists did not wish the quotations to be regarded as mere allusions, but to be seriously taken as prophecies, or as proofs that their Master was the Messiah, while at the same time they knew that the events in His life were not the final cause, then the consequences cannot be better described than by the words of St. Augustine in his 28th Epistle to St. Jerome:—

"Admisso semel in tantum auctoritatis fastigium officioso aliquo mendacio, nulla illorum Bibliorum particula remanebit, quæ non, ut cuique videbitur, vel ad mores difficilis vel ad fidem incredibilis eadem perniciosissima regula ad mentientis auctoris consilium officiumque referatur."

Baptist, but everyone may not be aware that in the opinion of the most reliable commentators it primarily means the return of the Jews from Babylon; and if the mission of the precursor is also signified, that it is so in the secondary or higher sense. We have here, it appears, a double prophecy. Isaias foretold the end of the Babylonian captivity literally, and St. John's office mystically. Or, to put it in another light, the return he predicted was a type or a real prophecy of a still greater event, namely, man's Redemption. The words, "Behold a voice," &c., stop, so to speak, at the event (the return from Babylon); but that event is not the terminus; in its turn it goes on to signify redemption. In a word, here, as before (Jer. xxxi. 15), there is *real* prophecy commencing where *verbal* prophecy ends. And we are shown by St. Matthew once more the mystical sense of an Old Testament event—an occurrence wonderful indeed in itself, like the passage of the Red Sea, &c.—still but one of the shadows of the good things that were to come, a ray of the dawn in its dimness and semi-darkness when compared with the flood of light at noonday.

It is generally understood that the captivity of Babylon and the return thence to the Holy Land had a mystical sense, that they typified respectively the slavery of sin and the liberty of grace. In spiritual books "Babylon" has only this figurative meaning; hence the mention of it is followed almost exclusively by a spontaneous moral reflection in many pious minds. To them the name is a synonym for evil, and it is nothing more. They never think of the ancient capital of Chaldea. (No reader will misunderstand this; no reader will fancy that the writer depreciates simple piety—that would be to miss the drift of his remarks and the truth they contain.) So too when they hear these words read in the Gospel (St. Luke) for the fourth Sunday of Advent, it never occurs to them that the words may mean something quite distinct from the Baptist's preaching, and long anterior to it.

Even some students of Scripture (and to them these lines are addressed) may hesitate to admit the prior meaning here claimed for the words of text. It seems so natural to

refer them directly to St. John, while it is not easy to believe that they can apply to the return of the Jews from Babylon. Are we asked to believe, they will say, that a voice was heard in the desert then? Certainly not; but this question has touched on the sole difficulty of the mystical interpretation. This arises, as we shall now proceed to show, from the figurative language employed by Isaias; and it is not a real, but an apparent difficulty; neither is it peculiar to this passage. Rachel's wailing is a parallel instance; so what was said above applies equally here. Jeremias does not assert that when the Jews were to depart, Rachel would rise from the dead and weep; nor does Isaias affirm that a voice would be heard in the desert before they returned. Such expressions are only inspired Oriental imagery, familiar to all who are conversant with the prophets. In Isaias, for instance, many figures, still bolder and more sublime, could readily be pointed out. To force a prosaic meaning upon such passages, would be to deprive them of all their grandeur, intense reality, and power. To understand Isaias here *literally*, would be to misunderstand him.

34. Now, can it be proved that this verse is a prophecy of the return from Babylon? Let the reader open his Bible, and compare the verse with its context. In the preceding chapter (xxxix.) Isaias describes that action of Ezechias which was after the king's death to be punished by the captivity of his people. But the denunciation is, as usual, speedily followed by words of comfort. In the opening verses of the fortieth chapter the prophet comforts the people with the assurance that Divine justice would later on be satisfied, and that Jerusalem would have to suffer no more. This certainly means that the exiles would return. When this was revealed, so glorious was the prospect which displayed itself before his prophetic vision, that even we need be at no loss to understand why Isaias depicts the end of Juda's captivity in such glowing colours. Let us reflect on the event as subsequently described by Esdras, and endeavour if we can to realize its magnitude. To rescue the helpless Jews from the crushing oppression of the most powerful nation in the world, to bring down to the dust that Chaldean



empire, and to raise another on its ruins in order that their deliverance should be accomplished, and to make Cyrus, the greatest conqueror of the age, in his greatest victory serve as the instrument to restore them to Palestine—this was a work worthy of the Almighty. Hence the sublimest of all His prophets represents Him as a monarch returning in triumph at the head of His people. A herald goes before the king who is coming home victorious, in order that everything may be ready for His approach. The “desert” is the great Syrian desert across which the Jews had to travel on their return home (God and God alone delivered the people from Babylon—let no man dare to ascribe the amazing occurrence to himself, for man's strength is mere impotence vv. 6-8). Then the main subject is resumed, and continued with certain intermissions to xlv. last verse xlv. 1-6 where we stop, for this is the famous prophecy in which Cyrus is mentioned by name.<sup>1</sup> Thus we see that the meaning of a voice crying in the desert, &c., here maintained is the only one compatible with the context before and after. As regards the herald, historians (Apprian, &c.) tell us that in ancient times this custom prevailed in the East, and in the “desert,” the open country where the track

<sup>1</sup> As is well known, Josephus relates that when Cyrus read the prophecy of Isaias about himself, he honoured the God of the Jews, and issued the edict for their return to the land of their fathers. (Ant. xi. 1-2.) Knabenbauer (St. Jerome, Forerius, Maldonatus, A. Lapide, &c.) remarks that Cyrus is addressed as “my anointed” or “my messias” (*christo meo Cyro, Vulg.*), to show that he is a figure of Christ, or the Anointed, *κατεξοχην* (*antonomastice*, more than *par excellence*), the Holy One, from whose holiness or “anointing” all other holiness is derived. This is quite probable; a type, as such, may be denoted by the name of its antitype; for instance, St. John the Baptist is for this very reason called Elias (Matt. xvii. 12); and so, in order to emphasize his typical or prophetic character and to draw attention to it, Cyrus might be called Messias. Yet it seems just as probable, that Cyrus is honoured here with the appellation, “my anointed,” as being himself a king, appointed for a special purpose by Almighty God, and so far forth raised to a special relation towards Him. In the Old Testament priests (Ex. xxviii. 41, xl. 13.), prophets (at least one prophet, Eliseus, 3 Kings xix. 16: see, however Is. lxi. 1, which appears to imply that the rite was general, and Josephus, Ant. 6, 8, 2, who says that David became a prophet when Samuel anointed him), and kings (*passim*) were anointed. It may interest some readers to know that two Rabbinical writers state that the kings were anointed in the form of a crown, and the priests in the form of a cross. (Schöttgen.) The high priest is called Messias

might easily be lost, such preparation would be obviously needed. Delitzsch is happy in his rendering the Hebrew text:—

“Hark ! one calling : In the wilderness prepare ye Jehovah’s way, make plain in the desert a highroad for our God.”

He remarks, too, that while according to the parallelism and the Masoretic accents the verse must be so read, the Septuagint, the Targum, and the Jewish interpreters agree with the Gospel. We prefer to follow St. Matthew, and to let the Hebrew (Masoretic) text take care of itself; but as Knabenbauer says truly the meaning of both is substantially the same.

35. Hence the words literally mean that the captive Jews will come back, for we must take them in their obvious sense, and as part of a closely connected whole. A collateral proof of this interpretation is afforded by the interesting fact that a contemporary of Isaiah, the prophet Micah, who repeats many expressions of his senior, describes the return from Babylon in almost identical terms: “For he shall go up that shall open the way before them; and their

(Lev. ix. 3, 16, vi. 20); at his consecration his head was anointed (Ex. xxix. 7, Lev. viii. 10, the hands of the inferior priests were anointed); and in Ps. civ. 15, we read: “Touch ye not My anointed, and do no evil to My prophets,” of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (with their families); and the kings were specially called the Lord’s anointed. (Saul, for instance, 1 Kings, xxiv. 7.) Cyrus is the only Gentile ruler to whom the title “Messias” is given; so that, perhaps, the meaning “*cristo meo Cyrus*” is “to my king, Cyrus:” if the Lord says, “my anointed, Cyrus,” then Cyrus is one anointed of the Lord, and is so far forth put on a level with the Hebrew kings, to whom with the exception in Ps. civ. 15 (regarding the patriarchs) the title of “the Lord’s anointed” is exclusively given.

The difference between the two explanations amounts only to this, the one maintains that here Cyrus is *said* to be a figure, the other that he is *not said*. The same difference is found respecting the appellation “my shepherd,” used of him in the preceding verse; one explanation being that he is so designated because he is a figure of the Good Shepherd; the other, because in that age kings were sometimes spoken of as shepherds. The people of Israel are often called a flock, and here in reference to their return. (xl. 11.) Knabenbauer appears to give the preference to the second explanation. The term *Messias*, applicable in its unrestricted sense only to Him who is Priest, Prophet, and King, is found in two places, Ps. ii. 2, “*adversus Dominum et contra Christum ejus*,” and Dan. ix. 26, “*Christum ducem*” (Messias *Nagid* = anointed King = King of Angels).

King shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them " (ii. 13).

At first sight it may not be easy to perceive that the explanation here given is the true one. Our personal standpoint is diametrically opposed to that of those for whom in the first place Isaias and St. Matthew wrote. The return from Babylon does not affect us sensibly ; though a great event, it is far away, and but one among the many we read of in inspired ancient history. But to the Jews it was not so, being nothing less than the resurrection of the nation, an indubitable token to them and to the world at large, proclaiming that if the line of their so-called earthly monarchs had passed away, Jehovah was still their King. It was a miracle. Though they knew that the captivity would end, though they could reckon (as did Daniel) the seventy weeks as they passed by, though they recognised in Cyrus the conqueror who was to set them free, yet when the day of deliverance came, they were overwhelmed with amazement. Their delight was more than they could bear, they could not realize that they were slaves no longer ; and as one of them said after he had reached Palestine : " When God brought back the captives of Sion, we were like them that dream." (Ps. cxxv. 1.) This wonderful event, as being a *real* representation was far more impressive and effective than any verbal description could possibly be. It was an "object lesson" in the truest sense. By their own experience men learned what bondage, freedom, and a deliverer were ; hence they were enabled to form, as Cardinal Newman calls it, a *real*, and not merely a *notional* apprehension—of sin, grace, and the Redeemer.

36. To revert to the analogy between this prophecy and the preceding one from Jeremias. Not the imaginary voice in the desert, but the *fact* of the return, is what St. Matthew indicates as the type. Here the characteristic scope of his Gospel appears again : to show, namely, that His Master had fulfilled the prophecies which as the Jews rightly held referred to the Messias. The tradition of the Synagogue to the effect that the return from Babylon had this mystical sense may be seen in the passages which Wetstein has

collected on Rom. x. 15: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring tidings of good things;" where St. Paul, citing *Isaias* lii. 7, uses precisely the same kind of argument as St. Matthew does here. Nahum, on the other hand, quoted this exquisite passage, primarily about the return, i. 15, where the "mountains" he speaks of are those which rise north of Jerusalem. Not only does *Isaias* in several places, but also *Osee* ii. 14, &c., *Michaeas* ii. 12, 13, *Jeremias* xxx. 9, &c., *Ezekiel* xxxvi. 9, &c., xxxvii. 11, &c., as Knabenbauer remarks, indicate the mystical sense of the events connected with Babylon. And how could the canticle of *Habacuc* be a Messianic prophecy, if it did not manifest it? So well did the Jews know their own national history, and the typical meaning of it, that to explain to them the nature of his mission, and his right to prepare souls by preaching and baptizing, it was sufficient for the son of Zachary and Elizabeth to say that he was the voice of one crying in the desert (*St. John*, i. 23); while, at the same time, so indispensable was it that he should present these credentials in order to be regarded as the precursor, that the other three Evangelists take particular care to state that the prophecy referred to him. We are not engaged here, however, in proving the fact, but the manner of the fulfilment. Our task is only to show that the precursor is signified by the mystical sense of the words. Many persons would think exclusively of him: they forget or pass over the Old Testament events and the gradual development of revelation. The prelude is lost sight of when the fulfilment comes into view.<sup>1</sup> It would be a mistake

<sup>1</sup> Some fathers and commentators, who do not however exclude the mystical explanations, mention only *St. John*. Knabenbauer gives the following names (*Comm. in Isaiam*): SS. Epiphanius, Jerome, Cyril, and Thomas; Eusebius, Origen, Irenaeus, Sabinus, Merodinus, A. Lapide, Gordon, Maldonatus, &c. Dr. McCarthy (*Ep. and Gospels*) thinks it very doubtful whether *Isaias* alludes to the Jewish captivity in any part of the chapter. Yet it would appear that *Strackiste*, *Rohling*, *Schanz*, *Knabenbauer*, &c., are right in maintaining the twofold sense described above, for it seems that the transition from the mystical to the literal sense not unfrequently found elsewhere, does not occur here. If in the captivity the future spiritual rejection of the Jews was signified, so in the return was the salvation of



to think that by purposely confining the sense in this way true Christian reverence could be increased. The correct theological view is that all the qualities which do not form the differentiating characteristic of the New Testament were possessed by the Old in a less degree. It was a rudimentary stage in the true evolution, that namely of revelation; a preparatory period in that calm progress of events by which God expresses and carries out His merciful purposes.

To repeat, then, the objection which it was proposed to solve—for it is the only one in the mind of such as we have just been speaking of. “No voice was heard, we need believe, in the desert preparing the way for the Divine Leader of the Jews on their journey home from Babylon—but more than five hundred years afterwards a voice was heard preparing the way for the coming of the same God in the flesh.” It has been fairly disposed of above, and there is

all, Jew and Gentile, prefigured. The theocracy was to be restored, but in a far higher sense than it had previously existed. Christ would, indeed, be a King, but His kingdom would be not of this world. However, though the Jews knew that the return from Babylon was a figure of something grander, yet the carnal-minded and un instructed thought only of earthly sovereignty, as if the “Promised Land” was Palestine and nothing more, or at most the millennium. How deeply-rooted this notion was, appears again and again in the Gospels; but in no place of the N. T. more conspicuously than in Acts i. 6, where the query is put to our Lord just before His Ascension: “Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel?” That same Lord, and His precursor as well, began to preach by announcing that the *kingdom of heaven* was at hand. This, the true theocracy, the keystone of the four Gospels, explains why this prophecy of Isaias about the precursor, receives such prominence and emphasis. It was particularly necessary for St. Matthew to show its fulfilment, because he devotes most attention to the prophecies, and he alone uses the phrase “the kingdom of heaven.” In his recently published commentary on St. Matthew, Knabenbauer says admirably (page 119): “Oraculum illud directe et per se quasi proœnium est quo instauratio theocratiae ab Isaiâ annuntiatur; illam autem intelligi messianam, statim pandit sacer vates. Is. 40, 5, et revelabitur gloria Domini, et videbit omnis caro pariter quod os Domini locutum est, idque ex toto quoque vaticinio (presertim cap. 42, 49, etc.) colligitur. Isaias enim maxime ob oculos habet jam 40, 3, seq. perfectam liberationem messianam, ad quam prior illa ex Babylonia tenue quoddam initium ac primus veluti gradus est. Unde si unquam, ante Messiam in quo gloria Domini maxime revelatur et per quem omnis caro illam videre debet *vox clamantis* et ad viam Domini præparationem invitantis debet audiri. Accedit quod in priore liberatione ex exilio nihil ejusmodi factum esse legitur: unde eo magis cognosci potuit ac debuit verba illa prophetæ ante adventum Messiae impleantur oportere.

no reason for repeating the answer. The quotation only shows once more that the words of a text may be verified metaphorically in its literal, and *ad litteram* in its mystical sense. Moreover, surely it is not incompatible with inspiration that St. Matthew should select from the description of the Return the salient point of resemblance to the true description of Redemption, and that he should with a passing touch indicate thereby that they were respectively type and antitype? What he did with regard to Jeremias, when he used the rhetorical expression about Rachael's tears to narrate the real woe of the Bethlemite mothers, he could do here with regard to Isaias. And, on the other hand, even if the inspired seer, in his many sorrows himself a figure of Christ, and the "Evangelical Prophet," were not privileged to behold in vision the events mystically foretold, nothing in their inspiration prevented the prophets from so writing that their words should be exactly what an evangelist wanted. Nay, is not this mysterious identity of thought and language on the part of men separated from each other by centuries, this union between writers in the Old and the New Testament, so utterly unaccountable for by human means, convincing evidence that they all spoke by the Spirit of God?

37. We will conclude with a brief remark on the two events in the New Testament to which these prophecies respectively refer. The Bethlemite mothers *really* wept, they rent the air with their sobs and cries when their infants were slain before their eyes. It was a piteous sight. No one could even hear of such barbarous cruelty without being filled with horror at the deed, or without being moved to compassion for both the victims and the sufferers. Such, indeed, was to man the massacre ordered by Herod; but how much more awful and heart-rending did it not appear to the inspired St. Matthew. He beheld in what happened at Bethlehem, not only the blood shed by a monster, an appalling scene of human woe, but a crime against heaven itself, and in consequence the direst vengeance of an angry God. As Jeremias, with prophetic eye, saw in the Captivity of Babylon, the condign punishment of sins innumerable, the expulsion from the Holy Land of the unworthy Jews,

their dispersion among the Gentiles, and the end of the theocracy; so did St. Matthew perceive in the attempted decide the full measure of the nation's iniquity, and as a result the rejection of the nation until almost the end of time. It is plain that the attempt to kill the new-born Messiah was not the act only of the crowned tyrant, but that he acted for the people, and with the people's concurrence. The Evangelist makes this evident: "Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." What took place under Pontius Pilate thirty odd years later was only the consummation of this desire. "His blood be upon us" was already uttered in thought, and heard in heaven. From that day forward "the writing was on the wall," even though revelation was needed to discern it, and time to execute it. The rejection had begun in Bethlehem as surely as it was to end on Calvary. What were the Captivity of Babylon and the sins which deserved it now in comparison with the sin of sins, and the spiritual death and reprobation of what had been God's own people? Only a shadow, a type; hence the Evangelist says that the prophecy partially verified in the time of Jeremias was completely so in his own. "It was *fulfilled*."

So, too, with its counterpart, the prophecy of Isaias. St. Matthew knew that St. John the Baptist preached truly that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. St. Matthew heard the King Himself proclaim that the eternal gates were open. A theocracy, to which the old one was but a prelude, was then established, and it is a kingdom without end. It is the *true* Promised Land, and into it all the *true* Israelites will enter.

As in the designs of God, the sin of the Jews and the redemption of mankind were connected, so were the doing away with the old Covenant and the establishment of the new. Hence the two mystical prophecies regarding the double event are brought together by St. Matthew. The same significant juxtaposition is seen in these words of St. John: "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, He gave them power to be made the sons of God."

REGINALD WALSH, O.P.

## THOUGHTS ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

What is meant by saying that God is infinite? We seem to wish to be told, as it were, nothing given us to throw light on the question. The outward exhibition of infinitude is mystery; and the mysteries of nature and of grace are nothing else than the mode in which His infinitude encounter us and is brought home to our minds. Men confess that He is infinite, yet they start and object as soon as His infinitude comes in contact with their imagination."—CARD. NEWMAN, *Sermon to young ladies*.

THERE is scarcely any doctrine so beautiful or so consoling as the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist. It is the central dogma of our religion and the very focus of divine love. When, indeed, we think of the excellence and the grandeur of this dogma, we are appalled at the large number of Christians who refuse to accept its truth, and instinctively ask ourselves why it is that so many, in many respects good and honest men, reject and denounce it with so much vehemence. Is it because such a doctrine finds no support in the pages of holy writ? No; that cannot be, for it is clearly and unmistakably laid down there in many noticeable passages; so clearly, indeed, that men are compelled to use violence, and to twist, contort, and torture the obvious meaning of simple phrases in their vain efforts to escape from the Catholic interpretation.

Is it, then, because it was not taught in the early Church, nor countenanced by the fathers and teachers of the first few centuries? Impossible. For history informs us that it was explicitly and emphatically taught in the Church from the very beginning, and not only taught, but, what is much more worthy of observation, taught *without a dissentient voice* for many long and eventful ages. It was not until the eleventh century that it met with any serious opposition. The famous Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, opposed it about the year 1050; but the Church, spread throughout the world, arose as one man and condemned him; while council after council solemnly denounced his assertion as heretical. After much controversy he renounced his error, and returned once more to the faith of his baptism.

If, then, both Scripture and tradition assert so unmistakably the truth of the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the



Blessed Sacrament, why do so many thousands of earnest Protestants deny it? They may assign various reasons, but if we analyse their statements and weigh their motives, I suspect that we shall find that the real secret of their repugnance to the doctrine lies precisely in its mysteriousness. They repudiate it because it is in itself so marvellous, so utterly unintelligible to the mind, and so brimming over with unfathomable difficulties. Men brought up on the principle of "private judgment" and "the open Bible interpreted by each individual," are startled and thrown back when they consider the literal meaning of Christ's words. They shudder and recoil when brought face to face with so tremendous a mystery. And though the utterances of Christ are plain and clear, and though He repeats His most solemn declaration again and again, and ever in a more emphatic form, they still exclaim:—"It cannot be! He surely must have meant something else. He must have been speaking figuratively and symbolically." They will allow anything rather than mystery; and prefer any alternative rather than submit their intellects to the obedience of faith. Hence, they refuse to accept the infallible word, even of God Himself, so long as they convey incomprehensible truths.

But why do men find it difficult to accept wondrous doctrines? Why are the mysteries of faith so hard to endure? Why is the incomprehensible in religion so repulsive to the natural sense of mankind? Well, for two reasons. Firstly, because they have never truly realised the extremely limited range of their own faculties: and, secondly, because they have never thoroughly mastered the fact that innumerable mysteries exist all around them, and are to be found in abundance even in the most ordinary and commonplace objects of daily life. Perhaps a few minutes will not be unprofitably spent in making these two points clear.

There is, of course, no creature upon earth who has been enriched with such countless and such signal favours as man. Yet priceless as many of them undoubtedly are, they are in no sense infinite. Though man possesses extraordinary faculties, they are extremely restricted in their operation.

Indeed, the truths which these faculties are able to reveal to him are the merest and meanest fraction of what still remains unrevealed. We are hemmed in upon every side. We live and move within an extremely narrow circle. We see, but only a short distance. The deep, fathomless depths of the interstellar spaces lie at unmeasured distances beyond our view. The telescope may help us a little, but millions of leagues beyond the reach of any instrument are, undoubtedly, worlds and constellations, and vast planetary systems that no human eye has ever gazed upon. All that our most perfect glasses can reveal to us is merely the outer fringe of the limitless garment of creation.

It is precisely the same with the sense of hearing. We hear, but it is only the grosser and coarser sounds. The more delicate voices of nature lie utterly beyond us. We can hear neither the impetuous rushing of the distant planets as they travel with lightning-like speed from one part of the heavens to another; nor the growing of the grass about our feet; nor the circulation of the sap and vital juices in shrub and tree; nor the bursting of the ten thousand times ten thousand microscopic cells giving birth to new life in its myriad forms. A veritable universe of sounds lies beyond the ken of the most delicate and sensitive human ear.

What has been remarked regarding the faculties of sight and hearing must be equally asserted of every other faculty, whether of smell, of taste, or of touch. And even if we arise from the senses of the body to contemplate the powers of the mind, the self-same laws of limitation are equally perceptible. The gift of reason or intelligence is, indeed, the highest and noblest gift of God to man in the natural order. It is this especially that gives him a claim to superiority over all the rest of the world around him. Yet how weak and inadequate a thing after all is unaided human reason. How restricted in its operation, and how narrow the circle of its influence. As a tiny child in some immense library draws a book from the shelves and laboriously and painfully spells out a word or two from its closely-printed pages, so man, with infinite difficulty, spells out a word here and there in the infinite book of nature.

“In nature’s infinite book of secrecy a little I can read,” says Shakespeare. Yes, “*a little* ;” but oh ! how little ! Man knows something—not much—about a few things. But there is nothing whatever of which he knows absolutely all that might be known. Indeed, without entering at all into the more etherial world of mind or spirit, we may truly affirm that our acquaintance even with material things is of the scantiest and most unsatisfactory kind. What we do know concerning the gross physical world of matter, compared to what we do not know, is as a grain of sand to a mountain.

Unhappily, man’s innate conceit induces him to dwell with complacency upon the little he does know, rather than to learn humility by contemplating the vast regions of truth lying beyond his mental vision. And this is, in part, the reason that so many are unwilling to accept the mysteries of faith. They are distressed and disturbed when they come across the incomprehensible in religion, and grow restive and dissatisfied, just as though mystery were a new experience, and as though they had never been brought into direct and personal relations with the incomprehensible and the inexplicable in nature itself. Their very surprise and hesitancy prove how entirely they have failed to grasp the fact that, before entering at all into the regions of the supernatural, they must encounter endless mysteries at every step of their journey through life.

When we discourse of the Holy Eucharist, of Transubstantiation, of the Resurrection of the body, we hear cries of : —“Impossible,” “Such things cannot be,” “My reason revolts against such doctrines,” and much else to the same effect. Dogmas which are at once incomprehensible and inexplicable, they imagine should be treated as incredible. Hence the importance of realizing how quite equally incomprehensible and inexplicable are many of the most ordinary operations of nature. All nature teems with insoluble mysteries. In every object, however commonplace, there are great depths, of which we can take no soundings ; and dark chasms, into whose lurid bowels we may peer and peer, yet ever peer in vain. Yet if so much of the *natural* world

is a closed book to us, how much more should we expect the *supernatural* world to be? If this earth is so full of inexplicable difficulties, and of dark places through which the eye of the mind cannot penetrate, how much more should we expect to meet with similar and greater difficulties and darknesses in the order of grace and of glory?

“Stand and consider the wondrous works of God,” says the Holy Spirit, by the lips of Job (xxxvi. 14). We will select one or two in the order of nature, that we may the better appreciate those which are proposed for our acceptance in the order of grace. We might pick out one of the more unusual and recondite phenomena of nature, but we rather prefer the most familiar we can think of: indeed the simpler and the more commonplace the better. Take, then, magnetic attraction.

We must all have noticed how a magnet and a piece of steel will attract one another. The magnet exercises a force over the steel, and draws it towards itself. How? We don't know. Nobody knows. It is a mystery in the natural order. The magnet and the steel are separated by a certain appreciable distance. How does the magnet throw its influence across that distance? Take two points, A and B, separated by the space of one inch (whether an inch or a thousand miles, the principle is the same). How can the magnet, resting at point A, act upon a piece of steel resting at point B, so as to overcome its native inertia, and to set it travelling over the intervening space? How, in other words, can a thing *act where it is not*—where it does not exist? What, if we may so express ourselves, is this invisible hand which the magnet stretches forth, and extends across the intervening space, and by which it draws the steel to itself? We don't know. *No man can tell.* Nay, further: place an obstacle between the two. Interpose, say, a sheet of plate glass between the magnet and the steel. In other words, cut off the communication—what then? Why, this obstacle proves to be no obstacle. The magnet acts upon the steel even through the glass. The steel responds to the action, and starts to meet the magnet. It presses with a real and measurable force against the glass, in its fruitless, yet



ceaseless efforts to reach the source of attraction ; and so it will continue, as anyone may test by experience. And what a simple experiment is this. Yet how passing strange. How hopelessly unintelligible. Who can really unravel the mystery, or give an exhaustive reply to our inquirers ? No man. It is one among those numerous mysteries of which the world is full. The child of yesterday knows just as much about the secrets of magnetic attraction as the most learned scientist ; that is to say, just nothing at all.

I might, further, point out how this attraction follows certain regular mathematical laws : how, for instance, its strength increases inversely as the square of the distance ; but this might make the illustration needlessly complicated. Let me, then, merely suppose that while the experiment is proceeding some learned exponent of science arrives on the scene. To my demand for an explanation he simply laughs good-naturedly at my simplicity, and exclaims condescendingly : “ O, that is a very simple thing. That, rev. sir, is nothing more nor less than magnetic attraction.” *He* is quite satisfied. He imagines he has answered me : but, in sober truth, has he explained anything ? Nothing whatever. He has merely given the phenomena a name. Am I any the wiser ? Well, I now know *what to call* it ; but I know no more *about it* than I did before. The mystery remains. Call it by what name you please, it cannot explain the fact. I am still face to face with the inexplicable. The only answer possible is, that things are as they are, and act as they act, because God has so willed and decreed. If, then, He decrees the inexplicable in the things of this world, why not in the things of the next world ?

Here, then, we have a mystery—an inexplicable fact—in the very lowest department of creation, viz., in inorganic and lifeless matter, in a piece of senseless and structureless iron ore. A mystery that, in spite of all the boasted advance of science, man’s mind is too imperfect to deal with or to investigate. He stands puzzled, confounded, and humiliated before a simple fragment of loadstone.

The higher we ascend in the scale of creation the more do wonders grow, both in number and in intensity. How

unspeakably more wondrous is the vegetable than the mineral kingdom. It would be easy to point out a host of marvels in every flower and shrub, and blossom and bud; but to economize space, I will pass by the vegetable kingdom altogether, and ask the reader's kind attention for awhile whilst I strive to point out the mysteries present in one of the commonest operations of the animal world. An operation which the reader has, no doubt, witnessed time after time; and yet, perhaps, never saw anything special to wonder at in it. Familiarity with a process has so strong a tendency to destroy our power of appreciating its marvellousness, that I think it will be of considerable assistance to us if the subject be introduced by a somewhat extravagant supposition.

Suppose, then, that some unknown person were to come to us from another world, and producing a small vessel should say:—"Here is a small oval box or receptacle made out of lime, and filled with a thickish viscid or glutinous substance. Keep it carefully for a few weeks in a warm and *even* temperature, and I undertake to say that without any further attention on your part, it will gradually transform itself into a superb gold chronometer, with dial, hands, main spring, and hair spring, lever escapement, and everything complete. Every wheel will be in its place and in ceaseless motion. Each hinge, rivet, screw, and other accessory part will be carefully formed and placed in position. The whole will constitute a watch, ticking merrily all the day, and registering the time at each succeeding moment." Such a supposition is enough to make one smile. One instinctively exclaims, "What nonsense! What a ludicrous idea! How extravagantly foolish: and, above all, how absolutely impossible." If, indeed, such a thing were really said, we should be inclined to think—(1) either that the stranger was stark mad; or (2) that it was a piece of mere clever juggling; or, if the promised result did indeed take place, that (3) a miracle of a very extraordinary kind had been wrought.

Yet, strange though it may seem, what is happening continually in nature is very analogous to what I have supposed. What we may actually see taking place in the

animal world is very similar indeed to what I have described, only immeasurably more extraordinary, immeasurably more mysterious, and—but for the fact that we can actually witness the whole process for ourselves—we should certainly say, immeasurably more impossible !

A watch is a beautiful thing ; a complicated thing ; a thing of many parts, beautifully put together and most cunningly devised and adjusted. But a bird is immeasurably more beautiful, immeasurably more complicated ; and a creature of a far greater number of most elaborate parts, far more exquisitely put together.

Take the egg<sup>1</sup> of any bird you please, let us say a goldfinch. When first laid by the hen, what is it but—(1) an oval receptacle or box formed of lime or other calcareous substance ; or, in other words, a shell ; and (2) filled with a thickish viscid glutinous substance. This substance is structureless and shapeless, and, for the most part, almost colourless ; yet, keep it in a suitable temperature for a few weeks, and it will become gradually transformed, by the power of God acting through natural laws ; not, indeed, into a watch, but into what is infinitely more admirable and estimable ; viz., into a living, breathing, sentient bird. Within the fragile shell, no thicker than your nail, changes and transformations are being gradually wrought, so singular and mysterious, that I know not to what I can compare them, unless it be to the changes that the earth went through during the six days of creation, when God brooded over the face of the deep, and drew order and symmetry out of chaos. A living being is being formed. The bones of leg and wing, the spinal column with all its articulations, the skull and pointed beak and sharp claws emerge, as if by magic, from out the liquid mass. Not only is each brittle bone beautifully fashioned, exquisitely finished, and polished as smooth as ivory—each different, yet all correlated—but they are knit together and adjusted with the utmost precision and harmony, and built up, *without hands*, not anyhow, not at

<sup>1</sup> “The egg from which most animals and plants are developed, is a simple cell,” says Ernst Haeckel, in his *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, vol. i., chap. viii.

haphazard, but according to a distinct and definite plan. Then, without as much disturbance as would suffice to fracture the film of shell, flesh and skin clothe and envelope the entire skeleton; while throughout the whole there run innumerable channels and secret passages and ducts carrying arterial and venous blood from one extremity to the other. Invisible hands are still moulding the beautiful form of the bird; and arranging its interior organs of nutrition and digestion, and forming that marvellous pneumatic pump, the heart, on the strictest scientific principles, which is to keep forcing the blood circulating throughout the whole organism year after year, without cessation, so long as life lasts.

Still the work proceeds. The original viscid glutinous liquid is all that the shell contains, or has ever contained. From it, therefore, and from naught else, is drawn the gorgeous plumage that is the glory of the bird. The wings are supplied with long, light, pointed feathers, suitable for flight, and the breast is coated with softest down of many brilliant colours. All is daintily finished, delicately tinted, and divinely made. *Digitus Dei est hic*. Yet, observe. The fragile shell is still intact. No fresh material has been introduced. All—bones, muscles, veins, blood, brain, skull, beak, claws, down, feathers, liver, heart, lungs, &c.—have been made from the simple structureless liquid albumen, mucus, cell-substance, or protoplasm—call it what you will.

Place your ear gently against the shell. Listen. Can you hear the great Artist at work? Can you detect any sound of implement or tool while the transformation is going on? Where but a short time ago there was nothing but a transparent liquid, we now find that the most wondrous and complex objects and organs have been manufactured. The eyes so bright, clear, and penetrating, of the imprisoned bird, though made *for light* have been constructed *in darkness*, and from the simple protoplasm. And consider what this means. For though the eye is but one organ, and a comparatively insignificant one, yet what a complicated thing it is. It includes the pupil, the retina, the chrysaline



lens, with the various blood vessels which feed it, and the muscles which move it and adjust it, &c. Yet all are there, and in their proper positions. So of all else ; the wings so swift and true and light ; the throat and lungs and vocal chords, all accurately attuned and prepared within the silent shell, await but its breaking, to emerge into the light of day, and to discourse soft sounds over hill and dale. All is being completed within that miniature universe. All is there. Nothing has been forgotten. Matter enough, but no more than enough, has been stored within the shell for the construction of every limb, organ, and muscle, and all else down to the smallest fragment of down that goes to complete the perfection of the bird. At last the shell breaks. The viscid fluid has disappeared, and in its place a bird darts forth instinct with life ; with glancing eyes, and flapping wings, and palpitating heart, and with a throat eloquent with song and softly warbled harmonies.

What a strange and wonderful history ! What a stupendous miracle of divine power and wisdom ! Talk of mystery ! Talk of the incomprehensible ! Well ! Here, in this familiar phenomenon we are confronted with a whole world of unsearchable mysteries. And so far from disappearing or diminishing as we inquire more searchingly and investigate more minutely, they rather become more insoluble and unfathomable. Nay, if we have not hitherto startled at the sight of these and similar transformations, is it not just precisely *because we have not paused to consider them attentively*, but passed them heedlessly by ? and because custom has dulled our minds, and because what is always going on and repeating itself for ever and ever fails to provoke attention or even to excite inquiry ? For what is the fact ? The undeniable fact is, that all creation is palpitating with mystery. Not a cubic inch of earth, air, or water, but contains enough to bewilder and confound the most enlightened intelligence. We live and breathe in an atmosphere of mystery. Above and below and around us lie unexplored and inexplorable depths—depths which defy all human soundings, and into whose dark and unexplored recesses man gazes fearfully and tremulously, but always in vain.

What do I say! Around him? Below him? Why even *within* him mystery dwells. Man is to himself the most bewildering of enigmas. Whence come life, motion, and sensation? What *is* life? What are thought and imagination? What is memory which binds the past with the present, and links together in one co-ordinate whole the experience of many eventful years?

What is sleep, that sometimes shuts up sorrow's eye, that steeps our senses in forgetfulness, and steals us awhile from our own company? Surely a strange and mysterious thing. And dreams—what are they, and whence do they arise? Whence come those strange and wondrous scenes, the phantasmagoria that pass and repass before the closed eyes of the sleeper, with all the vividness and speaking impressiveness of waking life; that call back the forms of the dead and the absent, and repeople earth with long-forgotten images of friends and foes! In the somniant state, the sleeper sees clearly and basks in the sunshine, though all the time he may be really buried in an Egyptian darkness: he hears sounds and converses with his friends though he lie in truth in unbroken silence: and even though his limbs are motionless in his bed, he may still be fighting battles, scaling mountains, or fording rivers. He is the sport of fancy, the plaything of hallucinations. In sleep he is, and he is not; at once all things and nothing. What is sleep? The echo answers, What? We are left to wonder and surmise.

Thus, question after question suggests itself to the inquiring mind, but for never a one is there an answer forthcoming. And, as it is with the mind, so it is with the body. Why does a child grow and develop till it reaches manhood, and then stop to grow no higher? Why is one pair of eyes brown and another blue? Why is one infant masculine and the other feminine? and how is the relative proportion of the sexes preserved throughout the world, and throughout the ages?

So again, how is life maintained by food and drink; and by what marvellous process is the *same food* transformed into such *wholly different things* as blood and bone, artery

and nerve; muscle and tendon, skin and hair; teeth and nails? And by what means is each portion of the organism (*quâ* organism) built up, distributed, and maintained in activity; and how is each instructed to discharge its own peculiar functions?

We need not to be told that scientific men have affixed learned names to every natural process, and have carefully labelled every phenomenon. For that means nothing. Any body can give a thing a name. Yet, many seem to forget, or at least fail to realize, that to *name* is not to *explain*. To label a mystery is not to solve it. A score of learned terms and definitions will not suffice to throw a bridge, even of gossamer across an impassable gulf. If I refrain from suggesting further difficulties, it is by no means because I have exhausted my stock, but merely because space is limited.

We will conclude, then, with the remark that, to look out upon this material earth, and to fully realise how mysterious is every object in it (as soon as we probe the least degree beneath the surface), teaches us a profound lesson. It proves to us how singularly weak and puny a thing is the human mind itself: it shows to us how straitened and confined is our knowledge of even the simplest things; and throws us into a disposition proper and fitting to receive with reverence and docility the incomprehensible truths of revelation. God is the infinitely Incomprehensible, dwelling in light inaccessible; and all His works have an element of the incomprehensible in them. But the higher we rise in the scale of creation, the more profound do these mysteries become. Their high-water mark is reached when, transcending the natural altogether, we enter the supernatural regions of grace and glory.

But of these, with the permission of the reverend editor, we will deal another time.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

## Theological Questions.

---

### ABSOLUTION FROM RESERVED SINS.

" SIR,—May I ask your opinion of my practice and principles under the following circumstances?—

" With us it is a reserved case to contract marriage in the Protestant Church before the minister, or in the registry office before the registrar. In our faculties we read a list of reserved cases, and No. 7, Nobis (i.e., Episcopo) reservantur 'Matrimonium, etiam mixtum, contractum coram ministro acatholico vel civili.'<sup>1</sup> It makes no difference whether a reservation is *penalis* or *medicinalis*. The bishop has condemned the opinion that affirms that 'ignorance of the reservation exempts the penitent,' and declares that a reservation must not be confounded with a censure.<sup>2</sup>

" We start, then, from certain grounds. The case is certainly a reserved case. A person comes to confession, and confesses having contracted marriage in the Protestant Church. From experience I know that if absolution is deferred those thus involved rarely return for absolution. I think that—not to mention my own experience—the general experience of the clergy warrants me in saying that not more than one-fifth of such penitents ever return for absolution. The custom here is to write to the Vicar-General for *faculties*. I hold I am not bound to write; but let that pass, as it is not my difficulty just here. Our priests obtain faculties by letter, the penitents do not return, and the faculties are never used.

" Now, I come to my own trouble. From experience I know that penitents rarely return. What becomes of them afterwards, I do not know; perhaps they get absolution at a mission whenever a mission is within reach; perhaps they remain away for years. Under these circumstances, I fear that my penitent will remain a long time in mortal sin; and, as a theologian, I hold that this is a circumstance which warrants me in absolving from this reserved case. I absolve only *indirecte* from the reserved, and *directe* from the rest, *injunctis injungendis*.

<sup>1</sup> Form. ii., Facul. Sac. Coadj.

<sup>2</sup> Syn. Salford ix., Allocutio n. 5, tit. Distinction and a Strange Opinion, &c.



“ I confess that the majority of priests I meet condemn me ; and, still worse, I cannot grasp their reasons. They say—while admitting my facts—that I am simply absolving from a reserved case ; the bishop has reserved it. I reply, that episcopal reservations must be dealt with theologically. My adversaries say that I abolish reservation. I deny it, and say they abolish theology. I appeal to Gury—Ballarini, and find my very principle there:— ‘ *Casus autem in quibus inferior sic (i.e., indirecte) absolvere potest sunt praesertim 1° . . . 2° . . . 3° timor ne poenitens remaneat diu in statu peccati mortalis ;*’<sup>1</sup> and ‘ *diu* ’ means from six months to five years. St. Alphonsus lays down the same doctrine.<sup>2</sup> D’Annibale lays it down. Frassinetti says the same.<sup>3</sup> I have Lehmkühl before my eyes, and the *Jus Novum* of the Holy Office, June 22nd, 1886 ; but I think the latter document, as dealt with by Lehmkühl, is out of court, as it refers to Papal reservations, while my trouble is with an episcopal reservation. What Lehmkühl refers to as the old Common Law, is what I lean on. He refers to a penitent being *prevented* from appearing before a superior for a *long* time (*a sex mensibus usque ad 5 annos*), but he says nothing about the reason insisted on *separately* by other theologians of name, that whenever the confessor fears (prudently, of course) that, unless the penitent is absolved he (or she) will be left a long time in mortal sin, he can absolve *indirecte*. I meet no theologians to inquire into the reasons for a long remaining in sin, they seem to be content with finding a theological reason in the simple fact that there is sufficient danger in the case. And as these penitents do not return to the confessor to whom they have already confessed, might we not overhaul the wisdom of putting an obligation on them to go to somebody else, when we simply introduce them to a new obligation (*sistendi superiori*) which we know that they will not fulfil. Can I, therefore, make the best of a bad matter and absolve them, without declaring the obligation of going before the superior, when I know *consilium not erit profuturum*. I take it all through that penitents are not in bad faith—they

<sup>1</sup> *Op. Cit.*, vol. ii., page 521.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. vi., Tract iv., *De Poenit.*, cap. ii., page 161. Edit. lauricensis, 1847.

<sup>3</sup> *Summula*, vol. iii., page 149, note 58, *sub. fine*. Edit. ii<sup>a</sup>, 1883.

<sup>4</sup> *Compendio*, seventh edition. Genova, 1882, page 672.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. ii., page 297. Edit. v<sup>a</sup>.

promise to return; but alas! the poor will is weak, and we see them no more. What about my principles and my practice?

“SACERDOS SALFORDIENSIS.”

1. Our correspondent has defined his question with very great precision. Ignorance, we are to assume, does not excuse from reservation in this instance; the reservation has been actually incurred: there is question of episcopal cases, and of *indirect* absolution from them.

2. We cannot, however, accept our correspondent's solution of the case, nor his interpretation of the theologians quoted. There are two classes of causes which excuse people from their obligations, and warrant a priest in absolving penitents, who may not be prepared to fulfil these obligations: viz., impossibility, and ignorance or inadvertence. When the excuse arises from impossibility, as when a person is excused from restitution by reason of his extreme poverty, the confessor is guided by very definite rules. Similarly, ignorance of an obligation or forgetfulness of a sin excuses for the time being. But when the penitent is *bona fide*, and might not comply with his future obligation if admonished, though some general rules may be laid down, the case must be substantially left to the prudence and discretion of the confessor. We will consider our correspondent's question in connection with both classes of excusing causes.

### § 1.

May a confessor absolve in these cases on the ground of physical or moral impossibility?

3. Though theologians generally treat this subject rather sparingly, still if we consider the reasons given for indirect absolution of reserved sins, and the practical solution of kindred cases, we shall be forced to conclude that the fear of a penitent's *voluntary* and *culpable* abstention from the sacraments in the future, and his consequent continuance in the state of mortal sin, does not excuse him from the obligation of an integral confession, nor constitute a necessity for present absolution, nor justify the confessor in absolving. To quote a few theologians. The *Salmanticensis* write:—“In casu

necessitatis . . . potest inferior sacerdos . . . absolvere . . . Et ratio est quia licet ea confessio fieri non possit materialiter integra ab defectum jurisdictionis in sacerdote in peccata reservata, sufficit servari formalem integritatem . . . et integritas confessionis, et absolutio directa omnium peccatorum poenitentis non est de essentia et necessitate sacramenti poenitentiae, sed praecepti divini, cujus ommissio saepe honestatur *ob impotentiam etiam moralem*, tum poenitentis, tum confessarii, tum aliorum.”<sup>1</sup> And Gury writes:—“Potest confessarius simplex quandoque absolvere . . . Ratio est, quia ecclesia, pia mater, et quilibet superior non potest censi velle obligare *ad aliquid moraliter impossibile vel ad tantum incommodum subendum*.”<sup>2</sup>

Hence the general principle for indirect absolution of reserved cases is, that a confessor may absolve indirectly, when there is some moral necessity for absolving; when it is morally impossible for the penitent to approach the superior personally, or return to the same confessor when he should have received faculties from the superior: or when the penitent if sent away unabsolved, would suffer some other serious loss or inconvenience.

4. The present question, therefore, is akin to the more general question, “when is a person excused from the obligation of material integrity at confession, even in the case of unreserved sins?” Physical impossibility, we know, excuses; and so does moral impossibility. But the difficulty, or the inconvenience, or the danger, which constitutes moral impossibility, must not be *intrinsic* to confession, nor arise from the voluntary and culpable action of the penitent himself. And so with indirect absolution from reserved cases. A person who commits a reserved sin becomes subject to two distinct laws. The divine law requires him to make an integral confession of his sins; and the ecclesiastical law commands him to present himself before his proper superior, or one deputed by him. Nor is it enough for the penitent to confess all his sins, reserved and unreserved, to an inferior confessor.

<sup>1</sup> Tract. vi., de *Sacr. Poenit.*, c. xiii., p. 6, n. 74.

<sup>2</sup> n. 575.

For this is not an integral *sacramental* confession of all his sins ; as *sacramental* confession supposes the accusation of our sins to a priest who can absolve from them *directly*. Penitents are therefore bound to confess all their sins, reserved and unreserved, to a priest who can absolve from them *directly* ; and a priest may not *per se* absolve a penitent, unless he can absolve him from all his sins *directly*. But as there are excusing causes from material integrity in the case of unreserved sins, so also there are causes which excuse from the same obligation in the case of reserved sins. We need not say that should a person *forget* a reserved sin at confession, he is excused from material integrity. Similarly, the *physical impossibility* of approaching the superior, or returning to the inferior confessor, will excuse. And, finally, *moral impossibility* will excuse. When, therefore, a penitent with reserved sins confesses to an ordinary confessor, though the confession would not be sacramentally integral, and though the confessor cannot absolve from all sins directly, he may absolve directly from the unreserved, and indirectly from the reserved sins, if the penitent cannot, without grave inconvenience, approach the superior or return to confession when the faculties should have been obtained by letter. The difficulty, however, of returning to confession, or the inconvenience or injury which may befall the penitent, if absolution be refused, must be *extrinsic* to the confession of reserved sins, and must not be caused by the voluntary and culpable action of the penitent himself. Otherwise penitents would have it in their own power to completely nullify the law of reservation. Hence all the cases quoted by theologians, in which a simple confessor can absolve, suppose this *extrinsic* inconvenience to be associated with the refusal or delay of absolution. They are :—“ 1, *periculum infamiae vel scandali*, v.g. ex omissione celebrationis missae ; 2, *necessitas adimplendi praeceptum annuae confessionis vel communionis* ; 3, *timor, ne poenitens remaneat diu in statu peccati mortalis*.”<sup>1</sup> The first and second cases require no explanation ; and we believe that,

<sup>1</sup> Gury, n. 575.



in accordance with the general nature of moral impossibility, and moral necessity of immediate absolution, the third case contemplates a penitent who, if he were sent away unabsolved, would remain for a considerable time in mortal sin, because he *could not*, without grave inconvenience, approach the superior or return again to confession.

5. That this is the correct interpretation of theologians, is also proved by the solution of a similar case in Gury:—<sup>1</sup>

“Cocles, vir militaris, non infimo gradu insignitus, die quadam Ecclesiam ingressus, ad sedem confessionalem primum obviam accessit, et ad pedes Rufini, simplicis Confessarii, optima fide provolvitur. Mox autem Rufinus peccatum reservatum inaudiens haeret anceps, nesciens quid sit faciendum. Etenim, si virum absolutione vacuum dimittat, hic forte, animo dejectus, *alium Confessarium non adibit*. Timet insuper ne hominem hunc barbarum offensum habeat. Attamen, jubente conscientia, declarat se facultate ad absolvendum a tanto peccato destitui, et alium Confessarium majori potestate pollentem adeundum esse. Tum Cocles: ‘Mehercule! ait indignabundus, quis rem adeo singularem vidit unquam? Quare igitur *te in aperta officina constituis, si instrumentis ad operandum necessariis cares?*’ Rufinus autem, ne militem a confessione deterreat, eum *indirecte* a reservato absolvit et dimittit. . . . An Cocles a Rufino Confessario absolvi potuerit.

“Resp. Negative. Nulla enim ratio gravis urgebat, ut ex casu apparet. . . . *Si miles autem absque mora proficisci deberet in alium locum, vel non facile ad Rufinum revertere posset, indirecte* a reservato, et *directe* ab aliis peccatis absolvendus esset, eo tamen monito ut, data opportuna occasione, Superiorem vel delegatum ad reservata adiret.”

6. Hence we conclude that, in the case mentioned by our correspondent, the penitent is not excused by any impossibility from returning again to confession, and making an integral confession; that there is no inconvenience likely to arise from the mere postponement of absolution, but only from the voluntary and culpable action of the penitent himself; and that the confessor cannot, on the pretext of moral impossibility, give absolution merely because the penitent would otherwise, of his own free choice, remain away from the sacraments, and continue in the state of sin.

<sup>1</sup> *Casus conscientiae*, vol. ii., n. 610.

## § 2.

May the confessor absolve the penitent on the ground that he is *bona fide*, and that it would be useless to remind him of his obligation to go to a superior confessor?

7. The confessor cannot, as we have seen, absolve on the score of moral impossibility; but can he absolve on the ground that the penitent is *bona fide*, and that it is useless to send him to the superior or ask him to return? We are all familiar with the teaching of theologians regarding persons *in articulo mortis*. A dying man, *e.g.*, may have committed injustice; he may not advert to the obligation of restitution; and his confessor may consider it dangerous to remind him of his obligations. In these cases a confessor should not disturb the *bona fides* of his penitent, unless he were fairly certain that the penitent would attend to his admonitions. Apart, too, from danger of death, we know that confessors may sometimes omit to admonish their penitents, and absolve them in their *bona fides*. But the case of our correspondent is totally different. In the first place, Catholics know well that it is a reserved sin to contract marriage in the Protestant Church or in the Registry Office; and hence they cannot reasonably complain, if, when they confess to an ordinary confessor, they are sent to the superior, or asked to return again to confession. Again, what reason can there be for giving *indirect* absolution? The divine law requires an integral confession, and direct absolution from all mortal sins not yet directly remitted; the ecclesiastical law requires substantially the same; the confessor undertakes to write for special faculties; the penitent *can* return in a week without any inconvenience, but *will not*. How then, it may be asked, can the confessor give indirect absolution? Is there not even a presumption that the penitent is not properly disposed? We consider, therefore, that, generally speaking, a confessor cannot give indirect absolution in these cases. It may, no doubt, grieve him to consider that a penitent who appears to be disposed for absolution, should be sent away unabsolved; especially if there be danger that he will not return again to confession. But these penitents will certainly go to confession later

on, and moreover this inconvenience is not peculiar to reserved cases. A priest must remind his penitents from time to time of grave obligations, which, however, may remain unfulfilled for a considerable time. In this case, therefore, he must explain to his penitent that it is a reserved sin to contract marriage in a Protestant Church; that he will write for faculties to the bishop; and that absolution can be got without further delay by returning to confession on the following Saturday.

8. Finally, when persons come to confession *ignorant* of the reservation, even on the hypothesis that ignorance does not excuse from reservation, some grave theologians teach that the penitent may be absolved *indirectly* as the unforeseen and unexpected refusal of absolution would be, in these circumstances, a great gravamen to the penitent. Moreover, if it be possible for a penitent to know that a sin is in some way reserved, and still *bona fide* to expect absolution from an ordinary confessor, we may conceive an extreme case where a confessor would be justified in leaving the penitent in his *bona fides*, and absolving him directly from the unreserved sins, and indirectly from the reserved sins. For if it be lawful to leave *bona fides* undisturbed in the matter of restitution, and to tolerate a material sin against justice, we see no reason why a priest may not, in an extreme case, abstain from informing his penitent of the nature of his reserved sins, lest, *e.g.*, he might never return; and tolerate a material sin in the matter of the divine law of confession. But we think a confessor's ordinary practice should be to remind these penitents of their duty, and to send them to the superior, or defer absolution until he should have got special faculties to absolve them directly from all their sins.

D. COGHLAN.

## Liturgy.

---

### THE ASSOCIATION OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

The official documents issued in connection with this Association are so full and clear, that they require only intelligent perusal to be sufficiently understood. But, in order to facilitate reference to the various provisions of the several briefs and statutes, we will endeavour here to summarise and methodise them, and in the course of our remarks to raise some questions which we consider deserving of discussion.

#### I. THE OBJECT OF THE ASSOCIATION.

"The object of this Pious Association is that Christian families may consecrate themselves to the Holy Family of Nazareth, placing it before them for veneration and imitation, offering up in its honour every day prayers before its image, and practising in their lives the sublime virtues which the Holy Family offered for imitation to every grade of society, especially to the working class."<sup>1</sup>

#### II. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1. The Cardinal Vicar of Rome for the time being is the President and Guardian of the Association. Assisted by three Prelates and by a Secretary he will direct the Association in all parts of the world. To him are to be forwarded, each year, detailed diocesan reports concerning the working of the Association.<sup>2</sup>

2. "The Ordinary of each Diocese or Apostolic Vicariate, the better to promote the Pious Association among the faithful, may make use of an Ecclesiastic of his choice, with the title of Diocesan Director.

"The Diocesan Directors will correspond with the parish priests, to whom alone is confided the enrolment of families in their respective parishes. In the month of May each year, the parish priests will communicate to the Diocesan Directors, and these, under the direction of the Ordinary, will forward to the central seat in Rome, the number of families enrolled in the Pious Association during the year."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Statutes*, No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Statutes*, nn. 2, 4.

*Statutes*, nn. 3, 4.



## III.—THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1. The members consist of families, not of individuals. The chief object of the Association is the cultivation of the peculiarly family virtues. Hence it would seem that individuals, as such, cannot be received into the Association, nor partake of its benefits. We invite discussion on this point.

2. Servants who live in a family as one of the household, taking their meals and sleeping in the establishment, would seem to be part of the family for the purpose of this Association. Such servants are always spoken of by theologians and canonists as being *de familia*. Hence, we are of opinion that they can be enrolled with the other members of the family.

3. The inmates of "seminaries, colleges, and separate houses of congregations and religious families," whether of men or of women, can consecrate themselves to the Holy Family in the same manner as single families.<sup>1</sup>

## IV. PLACE AND MANNER OF MAKING THE ACT OF CONSECRATION.

1. Can the consecration of a family take place in the *family home*? If we regard the English translation of the statutes made in Rome, and issued as *authentic*, as being formally approved, this question need not have been raised. For, in the words of this translation:—

"The consecration may be performed by each family separately *at home*, or by many families united, in the parish church, in the presence of the parish priest or his delegate."

But neither the original Italian of the statutes, nor the Latin, French, or German *authentic* translations of it, clearly bear out the English rendering. As this is a somewhat important point we have applied to Rome for information, which we hope to lay before our readers in the present issue. Meantime, for the purpose of provoking reflection

<sup>1</sup> S. R. C., Feb. 13, 1892. *Dub. I.*

and discussion, we subjoin the original, together with the various versions we have mentioned:—

“ Essa (la consecrazione) può farsi *in particolare* da ciascuna famiglia, ovvero da più famiglie riunite nella Chiesa Parrocchiale presso il proprio Parroco, o suo delegato.”

“ Haec (consecratio) fieri potest *singillatim*, a qualibet familia, seu a pluribus familis in ecclesia parocchiali collectis coram parocho proprio vel istius delegato.”

“ Elle (la consécration) peut se faire *en particulier* par chaque famille ou par plusieurs familles réunies dans l'église paroissale en présence de M. le Curé ou de son délégué.”

“ Die Weihe der Familien an die heilige Familie geschieht nach dem vom heiligen Vater Papst Leo XIII. genehmigten und vorgeschriebenen Formular), entweder von jeder einzelnen Familie *für sich*, oder von mehreren Familien gemeinsam in der Pfarrkirche vor dem Pfarrer oder dessen Stellvertreter.”

Now, neither in the original nor in any of these versions is there expressed an equivalent for the English phrase, *separately at home*, the single word, *separately*, being fully equivalent to the corresponding word used in any of the languages. Moreover, from the mere grammatical structure in every one of the four languages it might easily be inferred that single families when consecrating themselves should also assemble in the church, and that the parish priest or his delegate should be present in this case as well as when many families consecrate themselves together. But, as has been already stated, if our version be *formally* authenticated, this discussion, so far as we are concerned, is merely academic.

2. Is it necessary for the validity of the consecration that all the members of the family, or at least a majority of them, should be present, and take part in the ceremony? We think it impossible for any private individual to give a satisfactory reply to this question. For, though generally speaking, the heads of a family are regarded as fully representing the family, it is not quite certain that such is the case in this particular instance. For, in the first place, this consecration is a solemn act of religion whereby the family unites itself to the Association. It forms the greater part of the ceremony of its reception. Now, all such ceremonies

as receptions into confraternities and other pious associations, just like receptions into Religion, are made as solemn as possible; not merely because they are acts of religion, but also, and we might add mainly, for the purpose of making a deep and lasting impression on those who are received. But if the entire family can be received into this Association through one or two of its members—the others being absent altogether—reading the act of consecration, and handing in the names of the absent members, this chief object of solemn receptions would be lost.

Again, in the table of indulgences granted to this Association, the very first paragraph states that

“A plenary indulgence is granted (to the members) on the day on which they shall have entered the Association, and pronounced the form of consecration approved by us,” &c.

To gain this indulgence the usual conditions of confession and communion are required. Now, it is plain that the Holy Father intends that all should endeavour to gain this indulgence; hence he intends that all should receive Holy Communion. And if all are expected to receive Holy Communion, the inference is that all are expected to be present while the act of consecration is recited. But let us again warn our readers that our object at present is rather to raise than to solve difficulties; and if we seem to incline to a certain opinion, it is merely because we favour that opinion without considering it certain, or its contradictory untenable or improbable. Nor does the opinion just put forward regarding the presence of the members of the family during the ceremony of consecration at all imply that *every single* member of the family should be present, or that the *family* cannot be enrolled in the Association unless every member of the family consents to become a member of the Association.

The last argument regarding the reception of Holy Communion on the day of enrolment, suggests another reason for regarding with suspicion the statement already referred to; namely, that families can make the act of consecration *at home*. It would seem strange if, without pressing

necessity, the Congregation of Rites should give universal sanction to families to consecrate themselves in circumstances in which it would be impossible for them to receive Holy Communion, and hence to gain the plenary indulgence granted to members on the day they consecrate themselves.

3. Must the parish priest or his delegate be present while one or several families together perform the act of consecration? When several families together perform this act, they must be assembled in the parish church, and the parish priest or his delegate must be present. This is made quite clear by Statute No. 5, part of which has been already given :—

“The consecration of the families will be performed according to the formula approved and prescribed by His Holiness Leo XIII. The consecration may be performed by each family separately at home, or by many families united in the parish church *in the presence of the parish priest or his delegate.*”

We are of opinion that one of them should also be present when even a single family performs the same act; for there would seem to be just the same reason for his presence in one case as in the other. The multiplication of individuals or of families does not change the nature of the act. But, then, must the parish priest or his delegate, in obedience to the wish or the whim of any or every family in the parish, go to their private houses, and there assist at this solemn act? Does the Congregation of Rites not merely permit priests to take part, without necessity, in acts of solemn worship in private houses, but actually compel them to do so, if this or that particular family so desires? So unlikely is this, that we are inclined to believe one of two things; either that the presence of the priest is not necessary when a single family performs the act of consecration, or that this act cannot in ordinary circumstances be performed in private houses.

4. The formula to be used for the consecration of one or many families is the one approved and prescribed by our Holy Father. No other form of words is necessary. This formula, we believe, should be read aloud by at least one of the principal members of each family, the others repeating



it either aloud or in a subdued tone, or at least mentally. The formula may be repeated in any language; the following is an approved English version :—

“O Jesus, our most loving Redeemer, Who didst come down from heaven to enlighten the world by Thy teaching and example, and who didst deign to pass the greater part of Thy mortal life in the lowly home of Nazareth, in humble subjection to Mary and Joseph, and didst thus sanctify the family which was to be the model of all Christian families, graciously receive this family, which consecrates itself to Thee this day. Protect it and watch over it, and strengthen it in the holy fear of God, and in the peace and concord of Christian love; that, following the diving example of Thy family, we may all be worthy of everlasting happiness.

“O Mary, most loving Mother of Jesus Christ, and our Mother, in thy goodness and clemency make this consecration of ours acceptable to Jesus, and obtain for us His graces and blessings.

“O Joseph, most saintly guardian of Jesus and Mary, assist us by thy prayers in our spiritual and temporal necessities, that with Mary and with thee we may give eternal thanks and praise to our Divine Redeemer, Jesus Christ.”

#### V. ENROLLING THE NAMES OF MEMBERS.<sup>1</sup>

1. The Association of the Holy Family partakes of the nature of a confraternity, in so far at least that the inscribing of the names of members in a register is an essential condition of membership. But this is an Association not of individuals, but of families. Will it, then, suffice to enrol the family under the name of the head of the family, or should the name of each individual member of the family be entered in the register? In a document issued on the 8th January of the present year by the Cardinal Vicar of Rome amongst the duties which devolve on parish priests in connection with this Association is that of entering in the register *the families* desiring to join the Association.

“*Familias parocchie in sociorum numerum adscisci cupientes in tabulas referet.*”

The Committee of Irish bishops, in the suggestions

<sup>1</sup> Registers, ruled in red ink, with printed headings, can be procured from Messrs. Browne and Nolan, Nassau-street, Dublin, at the following prices :—Large size (288 pp.), extra half bound, leather back and corners, 6s. ; small do., cloth, 2s. 6d.

which they offer for the "uniform and effective working of the Association," leave the question just where it is left by the Cardinal Vicar. The third of their suggestions runs as follows :—

"That parish priests be instructed to provide a book in which *the names of families* joining the Association may be enrolled."

2. Must the actual writing of the names in the register be done by the parish priest with his own hand? The question is suggested by the wording of Statute No. 4.

"The diocesan directors will correspond with the parish priest, *in whose office* is confided the enrolment of families in their respective parishes."

Notwithstanding these words, however, we are of opinion that it is not necessary for the parish priest to enter the names with his own hand. The law in this case is to be interpreted as similar laws have already been interpreted. And, in the case of confraternities, in which the insertion of the names in a register is essential to membership, as it is in the present case, the director need not necessarily write the names. It will suffice, when large numbers are being received at the same time, for the names to be written by some one, not necessarily a priest, chosen for that purpose by the director; but the director must, in such case, authenticate each page by his signature or initials written at the foot of the page.

#### VI. DEVOTIONAL EXERCISES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1. Several devotional exercises are recommended to the members in a recent instruction of the Cardinal Vicar; with the express understanding, however, that no strict obligation of performing them is imposed. The words of the instruction on this latter point are :—

"*Pietatis exercitationes, quas diximus enixe commendantur eis qui ad Piam Consociationem pertinent, nullatenus tamen eorum onerata conscientia.*"

But though neither of obligation, nor even necessary for valid membership of the Association, most of these pious exercises are necessary for gaining the indulgences granted to members.

2. Daily family prayer, or prayer in common before a picture of the Holy Family, is one of the chief exercises of devotion recommended. The sixth of the statutes of the Association speaks of this devotion as follows:—

“The picture of the Holy Family ought to be in the homes of every family enrolled. The members of the family shall offer up at least once a day, if possible in the evening, prayers in common, in presence of this picture. The formula of prayers approved by Our Holy Father Leo XIII. is recommended especially for that purpose, as well as the frequent use of the well-known ejaculations:—

*Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul.*

*Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony.*

*Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I breathe out my soul in peace with you.”*

From this statute it follows that each family should have a picture of the Holy Family, that they should assemble before it at least once a day, “if possible in the evening,” and recite some form of prayer in common. The following is the prayer approved of by Our Holy Father:—

PRAYER<sup>1</sup> FOR DAILY RECITATION BEFORE A REPRESENTATION  
OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

“O most loving Jesus, Who by Thy ineffable virtues and by the example of Thy domestic life didst consecrate the Family which Thou didst chose on earth; in Thy clemency look down upon this household, humbly prostrate before Thee and imploring Thy mercy. Remember that this family belongs to Thee, for to Thee we have in a special way dedicated and devoted ourselves. Look upon us in Thy loving-kindness, preserve us from every danger, give us help in the time of need, and grant us the grace to persevere to the end in the imitation of Thy Holy Family; that, having revered Thee and loved Thee faithfully on earth, we may bless and praise Thee eternally in heaven.

“O Mary, most sweet Mother, to thy intercession we have recourse, knowing that thy Divine Son will hear thy prayers.

“And do Thou, O glorious Patriarch, St. Joseph, assist us by thy powerful mediation, and offer, by the hands of Mary, our prayers to Jesus.”

<sup>1</sup> Leaflets containing this prayer neatly printed in red and black beneath a little medallion of the Holy Family, together with lists of the indulgences and privileges, and the form of consecration, can be had from Messrs. Browne & Nolan, Nassau-street, Dublin, for 1s. 6d. per 100.

The picture, which is to be hung up in the house of each family enrolled, must "be in harmony with the peculiar idea of the Association." The seventh statute speaks thus of the conditions required in the picture:—

"The picture of the Holy Family required shall be either that mentioned in the Letter of Pius IX., January 5th, 1870, or any other in which our Lord Jesus Christ is represented in the hidden life which He led with the Blessed Virgin His Mother, and her most chaste spouse, St. Joseph. The Ordinary has the power, according to the rules of the Council of Trent, to exclude those pictures or images which may not be in harmony with the peculiar idea of the Association."

The committee of Irish bishops already referred to selected four pictures each of which they approve of as fulfilling the required conditions. They say:—

"With reference to the picture or representation of the Holy Family, to be set up in every house where the family is enrolled, and before which the prescribed prayers should be recited, we have selected four that we venture to recommend."<sup>1</sup>

But the devotion chiefly recommended for those daily visits to the pictures of the Holy Family, is that beautiful devotion which has ever been a family devotion in Ireland, the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the Instruction already referred to, issued recently by the Cardinal Vicar, this devotion is thus recommended to the members of the Association:—

"Deut operam ut semel saltem in die ante Sacrae Familiae imaginem communes fundantur preces, in quibus *præcipua ratione commendatur Rosarii et honorem Deiparae recitatio.*"

3. The members are also exhorted to approach the sacraments frequently, particularly on the more solemn feasts of the year, and above all on the day when the yearly renewal of the consecration of the family is made. Among the more solemn feasts here referred to are those on which the members of the Association may gain a plenary

<sup>1</sup> Pictures can be had from Mr. J. Arigho, 17 & 18, Christchurch-place, Dublin, at the following prices:—*Framed in 3-in. rosewood and gold*—No. 1, per dozen, 4s.; No. 2, 6s.; No. 3, 10s.; No. 4, 24s. *Unframed*, per dozen, 9d., 1s., 3s., 10s.



indulgence according to the terms of the recent grant of indulgences by the Holy Father. All these feasts the Associates are recommended to celebrate with peculiar devotion and fervour. But chief among the feasts which they are to honour thus is the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany, which has been constituted the Feast of the Association.

The following suggestions, drawn up by a committee of Irish bishops selected for that purpose, are very instructive, and will form a suitable conclusion to our explanations:—

“ 1st. We direct particular attention to Nos. 4, 5, and 6 of the statutes approved by the Holy Father.

“ 2nd. To have the Pious Association recommended from the pulpit, and have its objects explained to the people, especially at missions, retreats, and in country parishes when stations are being held.

“ 3rd. That parish priests be instructed to provide a book in which the names of families joining the Association may be enrolled. *This enrolment, be it observed, is a necessary condition for gaining the indulgence.*

“ 4th. With reference to the picture or representation of the Holy Family, to be set up in every home where the family is enrolled, and before which the prescribed prayers should be recited, we have selected four that we venture to recommend.

“ 5th. Leaflets are also available containing the Act of Consecration of Families, the prayers to be recited before the pictures, and the list of indulgences granted by the Holy Father.

“ 6th. At least one General Meeting of the Associates in each parish should be held in the course of the year. Other meetings at more frequent intervals may also be held either on the days named in the Papal Brief on which plenary indulgences may be gained, or on other days, as the bishop or parish priest may consider suitable or convenient.

“ 7th. Existing Sodalties of the Holy Family, as established by or according to the Rules of the Redemptorist Fathers in this country, are not identical with this Pious Association, and consequently are not interfered with.

“ They are Sodalties of *individuals*: this is an Association of *Families*.”

POINTS SUBMITTED AT ROME FOR SOLUTION, AND THE  
REPLY.

I.

The following is the difficulty regarding enrolment:—In the *Statutes*, No. 4, it is stated that “to the parish priest alone is confided the enrolment of families in their respective parishes.” Is the enrolment, then, or writing of the names in the register, so peculiarly the duty of the parish priest that no one else, even though delegated by the parish priest, can do this? Or will it suffice, as in the case of confraternities, for the parish priest, when some one else deputed by him has entered the names, to put his signature or initials at the foot of each page?

II.

Two difficulties occur to me regarding the *consecration* of families to the “Holy Family,” and one regarding the *enrolment* of names.

The difficulties regarding the *consecration* are these:—

1. Can families make the act of consecration *in their own homes*, or is it necessary that even single families should make this act in the *parish church*, in presence of the parish priest or his delegate?

2. If it be answered that each family can make their act of consecration in their own homes, will it, then, be necessary for *the parish priest or his delegate to be present* when they are making it, so that they may make it in his presence?

(If we accept the official English translation of the *Statutes*—which, however, does not seem to agree with either the original Italian or with the Latin, French, or German official translations—it would seem that the consecration could take place “at home,” “by each party separately;” but it would still remain doubtful whether the parish priest or his delegate should be present at the ceremony of consecration.)

We have received to-day (29th May) the following important communication per our Roman correspondent, for whose kindness we are deeply grateful.

The answer to the second question is not sufficiently definite, and we purpose availing ourselves of the kind offer of our friend to have a formal *Dubium* proposed for an official reply.

“Rome, 25th May, 1893.

“VERY REV. SIR,—In reply to your esteemed communication regarding the enrolment of families in the Association of the Holy Family, I beg to say that the opinion of competent persons here upon the doubts set forth is—

“1. A parish priest can authorise anyone to keep the register.

“2. It should be better that a number of persons would conjointly consecrate their respective families on any given occasion, appointed by the parish priest or his delegate, and in the church.

“There seems to be no need for an official reply; but should you wish for one, I shall willingly have it presented.”

D. O'LOAN.

---

## Notices of Books.

---

HISTORY OF CLARE AND THE DALCASSIAN CLANS OF TIPPERARY, LIMERICK, AND GALWAY. By the Very Rev. P. White, P.P., V.G. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son.

IN a short preface to this work the learned author informs us that it was written under many disadvantages, and that he offers it to the public more as a kind of elementary history than as an attempt at erudite research. Whatever may have been the circumstances under which it was put together, we are of opinion that it will be all the more useful and all the more welcome to the general reader of history, and to Clare men in particular, for not being weighted with heavy disquisitions on matters of detail or matters of pure controversy. It is essentially a substantial book. It contains an immense mass of historic facts, splendidly narrated and well connected together. With a diligence beyond all praise the author has collected the records of his native county, which were scattered over various books, chronicles, manuscripts, and journals, and has presented them here in a consecutive history, the chapters of which are arranged to the best possible advantage, and written in a most attractive style. The

history opens with an interesting topographical description of the county, of its scenery, soil, lakes, minerals, environment. A chapter is given to the origin of its people, and another to the introduction of Christianity amongst them. In this latter chapter the most interesting feature is a sketch of the life of St. Senan, founder of the Monastery of Iniscatha, near Kilrush. We find subsequently accounts of the foundation of the other great religious establishments of Clare, of the abbeys and monasteries of Corcomroe, Quin, Killaloe, Clonroad, Iniscaltra. We cannot give an analysis here of the whole work; but there are three periods in the general history of Ireland in which Clare and its people played a particularly prominent part, and which we find treated by Dr. White with the greatest success. The first was the period when not only Clare but the whole country was ruled from Kincora—a period of incessant warfare, but which was signalized at last by the defeat and expulsion of the Danes. The second embraces the years of the splendid struggle which the Catholic gentry and people made in defence of their faith and property, in 1641, against the infamous system of spoliation initiated by Strafford, and treacherously pushed forward by his successor, the Marquis of Ormond. The third includes the contests of the present century, beginning with Catholic Emancipation, the movement for Repeal of the Legislative Union, and coming down through the “Young Ireland” struggle to recent events. In his presentation of these three periods Dr. White displays not only an intimate knowledge of all the details connected with them in Clare, but also a perfect mastery of the general history of Ireland in these times. His description of the sufferings and spoliation of the Catholics of Clare under Elizabeth, Cromwell, William III., and Queen Anne, is also very vivid. But it is, perhaps, in his account of the events of the present century that the greatest interest will be found—the exciting scenes of the great election of '28; his sketches of O'Connell's most prominent supporters amongst the Clare gentry; Major McNamara, who acted as his second in the duel with d'Esterre; Tom Steele, the well-known “Head Pacifier” of Conciliation Hall; The O'Gorman Mahon, who was popularly believed to have been at the head of the “Terry Alts.” The sad history of one of the most chivalrous sons of Clare and of Ireland, William Smith O'Brien, is also sketched. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy has given us, as he only could, a graphic and complete account of



the doings of "Young Ireland." Dr. White summarizes the part of his work which bears directly on Clare, and gives, in addition, some interesting details connected with the county at that period which are not to be found elsewhere.

The *History of Clare* is brought down to our own times; but we think that the author has exercised both sound judgment and good taste in stopping at the proper boundary, and not including in his history the deeds or achievements of living personages.

On a work of such value we have only a few observations to make. They will not, we trust, be regarded as hypercritical. The first one has reference to a point of general history. Of the many historic scenes which were witnessed in the famous mountain passes between Ulster and Connaught, the title of "The Battle of the Curlew Mountains" is now generally reserved by historians to the great contest of 1599, between Red Hugh O'Donnell and Queen Elizabeth's generals, Clifford and Radcliffe. The impressive and circumstantial account of that great event given by the "Four Masters" has thrown into the shade the numerous other encounters which took place in the same locality. The engagement there of the Connaught men and Dalcassians with the troops of De Courcy, in 1188, was a mere skirmish in comparison with the later event. When farther on, at page 219, the author makes a casual reference to the real battle, and to the influence of the Irish victory on Clare and the South generally, he greatly minimizes the numbers and strength of O'Donnell's army. All this, however, has but little to do with Clare. Sir Richard Musgrave, in his *Memoirs of the Irish Rebellions*, gives a pretty long account of a widespread conspiracy which existed in Clare in 1798, fomented chiefly, as he says, by Carmelite monks, who prepared the people everywhere to join the "United Irishmen." We are rather surprised to find no tidings of this whole movement in Dr. White's book. We take it for granted that the Frederick Lucas mentioned at page 316 should be Charles Lucas. It is a great loss that there is no index at the end of the volume. A work of this kind is frequently required for immediate reference, and on such occasions a good index is invaluable. There are a few misprints, but they are not of much importance. In the long array of distinguished personages, connected with Clare by birth or blood, which we find set forth in this volume, we are sorry to miss a few prominent figures, and feel not a little disappointed at their absence. There is one

in particular, on whose authority the author relies for a good deal of his information, and of whom we should expect to find some short notice in any history of Clare—we mean, of course, Eugene O'Curry. In a chapter towards the end of his work the author gives an interesting account of some of the literary celebrities of this country,—of Donogh Rua M'Namara, some of whose Irish poems are translated by Clarence Mangan; of Andrew McGrath, Hugh McCurtin, Thomas Dermody, Edward Lysaght; also of Macready, the painter; and of Power (Dion Boucicault), the dramatist, author of *Arrah-na-Pogue*, *The Colleen Bawn*, and other plays, but who never penned a coarse joke or painted a base Irish hero for the stage. This, we thought, would have been an appropriate place for some notice of him of whom Cardinal Moran has written that for sterling love of religion and country, in addition to his learning, “the name of Eugene O'Curry is the one among modern writers of Irish history the most universally revered at home and abroad, wherever the sons of St. Patrick are to be found. The illustrious Darcy McGee, in a soul-stirring poem written far away on the American Continent, thus proclaims the universal regret at his being too soon taken from us:—

“ Who are his mourners? By the hearth  
His presence kindled sad they sit;  
They dwell throughout the living earth  
In homes his presence never lit.  
Where'er a Gaelic brother dwells,  
There heaven has heard for him a pray'r;  
Where'er an Irish maiden tells  
Her votive beads, his soul has share;  
Where, far or near, be it west or east,  
Glistens the soggarth's sacred stole,  
There, from the true, unprompted priest,  
Shall rise a requiem for his soul.”

The same eloquent writer thus sketches the merits of O'Curry: “Ideals of greatness may and do differ. But if the highest moral purposes, sustained by the highest moral courage, constitute grounds and a standard; if the earnest union of patient labour and sleepless enthusiasm have any reason to be so considered; if a continuous career of recovery and discovery in a long-abandoned domain of learned inquiry may be called proofs of greatness, then assuredly, when Ireland counts her famous sons of this age,

that indomitable academician's name will be pronounced amongst the very first of her magnates."

As it is, however, the author has brought together and condensed into one volume a vast amount of information. He has earned for himself the lasting gratitude of all Clare men and of all students of Irish history. It must have been the work of a lifetime, as we are sure it was to him a labour of love. We have only to offer him our warmest congratulations, seeing that his trouble has met with the reward which it deserves, and that his undertaking has been crowned with complete success.

J. F. H.

IRELAND'S ANCIENT SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS. By the Most Rev. John Healy, D.D., LL.D. Second Edition. Dublin: Sealy, Bryers, and Walker. 1893.

IN reviewing Dr. Healy's admirable book, exactly three years ago, we ventured to predict for it an extensive circulation: and our prediction has been realized. For nearly twelve months the work has been out of print, and ever since the demand for a new edition has been general and persistent. To meet the urgent requirements of the public, and to accommodate the enlarged circle of readers which the merits of his book have created, Dr. Healy now issues a second edition, slightly enlarged, duly corrected, and at a lower price. We thank his lordship for his promptitude in complying with the popular wishes: and from our knowledge of the work, we have little hesitation in assuring him that we expect as appreciative a market and as rapid a sale for the second edition as we predicted for the first.

The secret of the extraordinary success which has attended the publication of this work lies partly in the subject-matter, but chiefly in its order of treatment and elegance of style. Information can be obtained elsewhere of the lives and characters and achievements of our early Irish saints and scholars; but the sources of knowledge are, from one cause or another, inaccessible to the general reader, and the greater number of our historians and hagiologists entertain such contempt for imaginative colouring and the loftier graces of style, that their works are calculated to repel all except the professional antiquarian. To use an expression of Lord Macaulay, they consider attention to such details "beneath the dignity of history." This we believe to be a mistake. Our age has been productive of literature, not alone in

books, but even in periodicals and newspapers, which aims at catering to what may be described perhaps as the over-refinement of modern taste, but which at the same time appeals to the intelligent reader as admirably adapted to the pleasurable communication of knowledge; and so stocked is the literary market with works of this description on all classes of subjects except history, that the author who is unacquainted with or ignores the technical principles of composition, will find himself behindhand in the race for success and fame. Not the least of the charms of Dr. Healy's book is its easy, lucid, and forcible style. He has perfectly caught up the spirit of our best modern writers, and though sometimes—an unavoidable circumstance in history—the facts may be unimportant, and the proper names all but unpronounceable, yet his glowing imagination and polished elegance of expression lends an interest to the commonplace, and enshrouds the most prosaic names with the warmth and brilliancy of romance. In his book the old chronicles have donned a modern garb, and the lives and labours of our ancient Irish saints and scholars become familiar to us as the career of our contemporary statesmen, or the most recent successes at our universities. When to this is added the fact that the work, for the most part, treats a subject which has been ever regarded as a miracle to prove the divinity of the Christian religion, and one with which every Irishman, at least, should be acquainted—the rapid growth and dissemination of learning and sanctity in Ireland on the introduction of Christianity—we cannot wonder that every college and convent and important school in the country is provided with a copy of it, and that no priest considers his library fully furnished until *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* finds a place in his collection.

In the first edition many typographical errors necessarily crept in, and an occasionally faulty expression—manifestly a *lapsus calami*—escaped the otherwise careful attention of the author. In the present edition all these have been corrected, and some of the chapters have been reworked with good effect. An additional feature of interest in the work is the publication of two admirable maps—one of Clonmacnoise, the other of the Arran Islands—to illustrate the venerable ruins of the homes of St. Cieran and St. Enda. The book is uniform in size with the first edition, while both letterpress and binding have been carefully attended



to. We trust, therefore, that the work will meet with the high success it deserves; and will become, as its distinguished author hopes, a means of inspiring others with admiration for Ireland's greatness in the past, and a desire to co-operate in achieving for her a similar greatness in the future.

J. J. C.

CARMINA MARIANA: An English Anthology in Verse, in Honour of, or in Relation to, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and arranged by Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Spottiswoode & Co. 1893.

EVERY lover of sacred poetry will rejoice as he turns over the pages of the volume which Mr. Orby Shipley has given to us under the above title. A more varied and interesting collection of verses it would be difficult to find. Selections from over two hundred authors, some being classical writers of the highest merit, are cited, the bond of unity in the quotations being a reference to the Blessed Virgin. The work is, in truth, a beautiful anthology, the sweetness and fragrance of which are enhanced by its being presented to our Blessed Lady in her own month.

The design of the work, as the compiler informs us in his preface, is to furnish a collection as well of English verse written in the past in connection with the name of Mary, as of "translations from foreign languages of poetry concerning our Blessed Lady." To carry out this design he draws from the most varied sources. The greater English poets, Irish and American poets, Syrian, Armenian, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese poets, composers of passion plays, Laments of our Lady, dramatic scenes, prologues, and dedications—all have been laid under contribution; and a very suggestive feature of the collection is the perfect unanimity, the uniform sweetness and tenderness, the subdued yet earnest piety, that characterize the verses throughout. In the process of compilation Mr. Shipley insisted on the presence of poetic merit as a condition; yet he kept constantly before his mind the lofty ideal of making his book a work of piety. "No amount of depth of thought or felicity of expression," he tells us, "has been allowed to condone for verse that is distasteful to the moral sense, or is erroneous in religious belief." The assurance is a sufficient guarantee, that while a work of art possessing singular merit, the book is also instructive and edifying in the highest degree.

It would be out of place in a brief notice to indicate the contents of such a volume as this in detail. For the sake of such of our readers, however, as may desire to know more about the work—and we are sure they are many—it may be useful to mention the names of some of the authors who are represented in its pages. We are glad to find our own country contributing a highly respectable quota. Moore, Griffin, D'Arcy M'Gee, Aubrey de Vere, Denis Florence M'Carthy, and his distinguished daughter, Father Matthew Russell, S.J.; Miss Rosa Mulholland, and Miss Katherine Tynan, are the most prominent of those who uphold the honour of Ireland. England's devotion to the Blessed Virgin finds expression in Chaucer, Chesham, Southwell, Dryden, Wordsworth, Lamb, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Rosetti, Tennyson, Browning, and several others. Langfellow and Poe are the chief representatives of America; while the names of Dante, Goethe, St. Liguori, and Pope Leo XIII. are sufficient proofs that the labour of translation was not unprofitably spent. It will be a source of gratification, if not of surprise, to many readers, that Byron, Shelley, and Poe, with whom we rarely associate religious feelings, are found to swell the chorus of praise in honour of our Blessed Lady. It furnishes from an unexpected source an additional verification of the text, *Ex hoc beatorum in cunctis nominibus generatur veritas*.

The work consists of over four hundred and thirty large pages, admirably printed on rich paper, while the binding is at once durable and tasteful. We hope the work may have an extensive circulation, and may inspire its readers with loftier thoughts of our Blessed Lady and more earnest piety in her honour. If it do, the Church will owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Shipley for his admirable book.

J. J. C.

THE LIFE OF DR. O'HURLEY, ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL. By Very Rev. Dean Kinane, P.P., V.G., Cashel. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is quite a marvel the amount of work done by the pious and venerated Dean of Cashel, especially when one bears in mind his unceasing energy as a missionary priest.

The Dean's style is generally well known, for his works have had a very large circulation. It is simple and unostentatious, and full of his own devotional fervour and enthusiasm. He writes for the ordinary faithful; accordingly his object is not to write learned

and exhaustive treatises, though all his works are solidly instructive ; but he keeps steadily in view the spiritual good of the greatest number of souls ; and as he knows that the supernatural life must be copied from the life of our Model and Master, so in his books the great Exemplar is always kept in view, and there is a continuous realization of the text, " Learn of Me."

The *Life of Dr. O'Hurley* is written in the Dean's characteristic style ; and, except we are greatly mistaken, it will attain the object for which it was written ; namely, to make known in a popular fashion the life and death of the martyred Archbishop of Cashel.

It would be difficult to select passages from the simple and touching narrative of the *Life of Dr. O'Hurley*, but we cannot help congratulating Dean Kinane on the clear case he has made for the martyrdom of the Archbishop. It was not for any purely political offence he was put to death, but it was for refusing to abjure the spiritual supremacy of Christ's vicar on earth, and to set up in its place the authority in spiritual matters of Queen Elizabeth.

We cannot do better in recommending this little work than to transcribe the following words from the preface written by the Archbishop of Cashel :—" It will edify all who read it, or who hear it read, and, besides, it will afford another proof, if further proof be necessary, that while Irish bishops and priests were at all times prepared to fight for freedom and country, they were also prepared to defend the prerogatives of the Holy See at the peril of their lives, and to die, when put to it, for the faith of their fathers."

In conclusion, we may be allowed to express a hope that this little work may stimulate others who have leisure and capacity to do something to bring to light the inspiring records of the history of the Church in Ireland, a field of literature so sadly neglected, and yet one so highly instructive.

SUCCAT: THE STORY OF SIXTY YEARS OF THE LIFE OF ST. PATRICK. By Mgr. Gradwell. London: Burns and Oates.

WE owe an apology to the learned author of this work for having delayed so long a notice of his valuable contribution to Patrician literature. The fault does not lie altogether with us. We hope, in any case, that a short review of it may be better late than never. *Succat* is an account of the life of St. Patrick

from his birth to the time of his landing in Ireland as the national apostle of this country. The narrative of the saint's life is written in a very agreeable style, filled in a good deal from the imagination where authentic materials are wanting. In every page it bears the stamp of a genial and kindly spirit, and gives proof at the same time of a serious study of the subject. It is but natural that natives of Scotland or North Britain should claim for their country the honour of having been the birthplace of St. Patrick, seeing that the claim is an old one, that documentary proofs lend colour to it, and that they are admitted as conclusive by such weighty authorities as Colgan, Petrie, O'Donovan, O'Curry, and Cardinal Moran. We do not wish, however, to enter at present into the merits of the controversy, nor to discuss with the learned author the question of the relationship of St. Patrick with St. Martin of Tours, nor the time and place of his consecration. All these questions are contested very warmly, and it would be rashness for one who is not an expert to mix or meddle in them. But apart from controverted points we have no hesitation in saying that Mgr. Gradwell's volume is a truly delightful book, and that he succeeds perfectly in imparting to the reader a good share of the interest and pleasure which he himself found in pondering over the life of the great apostle.

"For more than six years [he says in the preface] the sayings and doings of St. Patrick have been almost my daily thought. By my solitary hearth, or in my lonely walk, he has been my companion and my friend. If other literary pursuits have called me aside for the nonce, it has been with pleasure that I have resumed the thread of his history. And the one reward I look for is, that his saintly character, his heroic deeds may be more widely and more clearly known by the millions scattered throughout the world who look up to him as their father in the faith."

It is in this spirit that Mgr. Gradwell leads us in the footsteps of St. Patrick. His sketches of Conchessa, St. Patrick's mother, of St. Martin of Tours, of St. Germain of Auxerre, of Marmoutier and Lerins, are quite fascinating. He also gives very clearly and simply the authorities on whom he relies according as his narrative proceeds, not taking for granted any elementary knowledge on the part of his readers. This will be found very useful to those who study the life of St. Patrick for the first time. The author takes leave of the saint once he has brought him a second time to



the shores of Ireland. The rest of the field, as he says, has been cultivated by a hundred willing and able lands. The last passage in his narrative may be taken as characteristic of the whole work :—

“The winter had now nearly passed. The year 433 was fairly commenced, and St. Patrick set sail in command of a numerous company on a voyage which is one of the most memorable, and most momentous in the history of Christendom. The green sea bore him to the shores of Wicklow. He strained his eyes to catch the first glimpse of land, and watched the sugar-loaf mountain come in sight. Round its base the river Dargle winds its way to the sea at Bray, and at its mouth St. Patrick landed, raising the standard of the cross on its pebbly banks. What memories would fill his soul as he trod again the soil of Ireland! Forty-five years before, when he was a boy of fifteen years old, helpless and unfriended, he was brought to these shores to be sold into a barbarous land to a heathen master. He had trembled before the fierce and passionate Milcho, and shrunk from his blows and stripes. And now he came with a message to kings and princes, which they must needs obey, with power given him from above before which their trustiest weapons dropped from their hands. He came, the herald of the great King of heaven and earth, to preach the faith of Jesus Christ. His work was to gather force and volume as the ages rolled away, and after more than fourteen centuries it still stands and grows. Perhaps amongst God’s saints he symbolizes and personifies more than any other a nation’s faith and a nation’s love.”

With the reserve already mentioned we most heartily commend this book to all lovers of St. Patrick. No one can read it without becoming more devotedly attached to the great apostle.

J. F. H.

TALES FROM THE GERMAN. By Canon Schmid. Lactare Series. Art and Book Co., Leamington and London. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE tales of the genial Canon Schmid are too generally known to call for more than a word of praise of this selection of them, brought out by the enterprising “Art and Book Company.” As a prize book for children, it is sure to repay the pains of the publishers, who have turned it out in such excellent form.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JULY, 1893.

## ST. DYMUNA OF GHEEL.

THERE are certain features in the life of St. Dymuna which not only distinguish her from all the other saints of her native land, but which, in some respects, have scarcely their parallel in the annals of the universal Church. The number of virgin-martyrs on the roll of the early Irish calendar is comparatively small, owing, no doubt, to the peaceful manner in which the conversion of the country was effected. The Irish virgins who secured the crown of martyrdom received it in foreign lands, and amongst them St. Dymuna undoubtedly holds the most prominent place. Well worthy, indeed, she seems, to be enumerated amongst the frail but heroic witnesses to divine faith, whose firmness in the midst of persecution constitutes one of the most miraculous elements in the establishment of Christianity. The physical pain which she endured was not comparable, of course, in intensity or barbarity, to that which was inflicted on the virgin-martyrs of an earlier period. One has only to cast a glance at the history of the persecutions under Nero or Diocletian to realize the difference. The mind absolutely recoils from contemplating the tortures inflicted on such helpless victims as St. Euphemia of Chalcedon, St. Theodosia of Persepolis, St. Febronia of Nisibe, St. Philomena of Ancyra, St. Eulalia of Merida, not to speak of the great Roman virgin-martyrs—Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Anastasia, Cecilia, Agnes, whose names the Church has taken

into the Canon of the Mass, and whose memory will there be honoured as long as the sacrifice of expiation is offered up in any part of the world.

The constancy of St. Dympna was, in its special circumstances, not less admirable than that of these noble victims. Physically speaking, indeed, it was not put to so severe a test; but it was made to endure the strain of a moral ordeal which did not accompany the sufferings of these or of any other martyr with whose history we are acquainted. Saints there were, no doubt, in the early days of the Church who were sacrificed by those who should have been their natural protectors. Flavia Domitilla, the niece of Titus and Domitian, was not spared on account of her kinship with the persecutors; and, later on, the eldest son of Leovigild, king of the Visigoths of Spain, was put to death by the orders of his own father in one of the dungeons of Seville because he would not renounce the orthodox faith, and conform, like his brother Reccaredo, to the Arian creed. But in these cases the fatal deed was perpetrated by strangers and by servants, whereas the martyrdom of St. Dympna presents all the features of a domestic tragedy. The blow was struck by her own father, whose passion had blinded him to such a degree that he was in the end bereft of the commonest instincts of nature and of all human sense. The loss of life was in itself, we imagine, but a small thing to St. Dympna. The weight of her affliction came rather from the circumstances by which it was surrounded, and the flower of her martyrdom is to be found in the patience, the fortitude, the stainless purity with which she maintained her peace, and bore the heavy cross by which her fidelity was tried. No wonder, therefore, that she should be called, in the old Flemish tongue “Een Lilie onder de Doornen”—a lily amongst thorns—and be honoured as such in the Latin verses:—

“ O Castitatis lilium !  
 Virgo decus regium !  
 Dei martyr gloriosa !  
 Christo regi gratiosa !”

The oldest life of St. Dympna now in existence was

written by Pierre de Cambrai, in the thirteenth century. But this work would seem to be merely a translation of an older life written in Flemish at a much earlier date. In addition to the authors of the *Acta Sanctorum*, Molanus, Colgan, Miraeus, Baillet, a large number of historians have dealt with the life and martyrdom of St. Dymphna. Special lives of the saint were written by Ludolphus van Craywinckel,<sup>1</sup> canon of the Norbertine Abbey of Tongerlo, in 1652; by Felix Bogaerts<sup>2</sup> of Antwerp, in 1840; and Peter Dominick Kuyl,<sup>3</sup> curate of Antwerp Cathedral, in 1863.

These writers all, with the exception of Henschenius, the Bollandist, admit, without reserve, the Irish nationality of St. Dymphna, following in this the example of her oldest biographer.<sup>4</sup> Nor is Ireland's claim positively denied by Henschenius. He admits that his theory of her English origin is a mere conjecture, and the difficulties which he puts forward have already been satisfactorily answered by Lanigan and other historians.

According, then, to the best authorities, St. Dymphna was the daughter of one of the petty kings or princes who ruled this country about the beginning of the sixth century. Although Ireland was at that time practically converted to Christianity, a few princes seem to have still

<sup>1</sup> Een Lilië onder de Doornen. De Edele, Doorlugtige Maeghet Dymphna, Dogter van den Koning van Yrlandt, Patronesse van Gheel, Wiens Leven, Martelic ense Dood; ende ook van den H. Priestes Gerebennus haeren Biecht Vaer, door Fr. Ludolphus Craywinckel, Norbertyn der Abdye van Tongerlo, Vicarius in t'Kloster van Liliendael tot Mechelen.

<sup>2</sup> *Dymphna d'Irlande, Légende de Septième Siècle*, par Felix Bogaerts.

<sup>3</sup> *Gheel Verhaert door den Eedelaest der Heilige Dymphna*. Door P. D. Kuyl. Antwerp, J. E. Buschmann, 1863. See also *Lives of the Irish Saints*, by John Canon O'Hanlon, May 15th; and *Saints of Ireland*, by Mrs. Anastasia O'Byrne, pages 91 and 92.

<sup>4</sup> Post resurrectionis et ascensionis Domini completa mysteria, sicut ante prælixerat per prophetas cum in toto terrarum orbe per apostolos jam diffusa proficeret religio Christiana, fuit in Hibernia rex gentilis, qui licet timore Dei contempto superstitiosis ac vanis idolorum cultibus deserviret, tamen opum gloria et militiae saecularis vigore potenti ceteros antecellens, omnibus gloriosior apparebat. Erat autem ei uxor ex illustri orta progenie, quam rex ipse vehementer diligebat affectu. Hi vero filiam genuerant, decoris venustate, matris valde consimilem meritis et nomine Dymphnam, ut ipso vocabuli præsigio postmo tum, p'eo digna fore indicaretur." *Vita Sanctæ Dymphnae*. Apud Surium.



clung to pagan ideas and practices. Dymphna's father was, undoubtedly, a pagan. He is said to have ruled over that part of Ulster which was called Oirghialla, or Orgiel, and which embraced the territory of the modern counties of Louth, Armagh, and Monaghan. Her mother, who was as remarkable for her goodness as for her beauty, died at an early age, and Dymphna's education fell to the lot of some Christian attendants, who had her baptized and instructed in the true faith. The young princess entered thoroughly into the spirit of Christian life. She despised the dancing and light songs<sup>1</sup> which were indulged in by the maidens of her age, and secretly vowed herself body and soul to the service of Christ.

The King who was greatly afflicted by the death of his wife, soon commissioned his counsellors to seek a spouse for him, who should resemble in every respect the lady he had lost. They were not successful in their undertaking, but when all else failed them, they directed the attention of the King to his daughter Dymphna, who became each day more and more the image of her mother. Infatuated with this idea, the King now began the importunities which his daughter so firmly and so consistently repudiated from the first, and which, after years of annoyance, were to end in her destruction.

“Matre defuncta, filie rex concupivit speciem,  
Cernens illius faciem, sponsae vultus effigiem.”

This strange proposal will appear somewhat less astonishing, perhaps, when we remember that the King was an absolute pagan;<sup>2</sup> and that unions of the kind were not unfrequent amongst the heathen peoples of ancient times. They were

<sup>1</sup> Quae in domo patris nobiliter educata, cum annos pueritiae transeisset, chorearum assultus et jocularioras cantilenas et quae illi actas expetit et poscit celsitudo regalis, mente despiciens, occulte baptismum suscepit et se corde et corpore Christo devovit perpetuo servituri.

<sup>2</sup> In order to meet the difficulty that there is no trace in Irish history of any Irish king or prince having been a pagan in the sixth or seventh century, Dr. Lanigan favours the opinion that St. Dymphna must have been the daughter of one of the Danish chiefs who invaded Ireland, and that she must, therefore, have lived not earlier than the ninth century. This, however, is a mere conjecture, with very little to support it. It is quite probable that whilst the people generally accepted Christianity, some of the princes held out for paganism till the sixth century.

condemned, no doubt, by the more civilized pagans of Greece and Rome, and we may recall with what dramatic power Sophocles has disposed of such relations. It is impossible for anyone who has read the drama of *Oedipus*, to forget the woe and despair of the unhappy King who, without his knowledge or his fault, had contracted an incestuous marriage. When the mystery of his life is unravelled, his grief knows no bounds. He believes himself unworthy of the light of day, and puts out his eyes with his own hands. He foresees the cruel destiny of his sons, Polynices and Eteocles, and of his beloved daughter Antigone, and goes to his fate with an overwhelming consciousness of wrong.

In many parts of the East, however, no such strong feeling existed. In Persia, in particular, from the earliest times, the law of consanguinity was violated. Even amongst the chosen people, the angels of heaven had not long rescued Lot<sup>1</sup> and his family from the doom of the cities of the plain, when they gave to the world an example of the dissolute manners that prevailed around their former domicile; and we know that Tamar pined away in the house of Absalom her brother, not so much on account of the wrong inflicted upon her by her elder brother, Amnon,<sup>2</sup> as because the consent of their father, David, had not been asked to regulate the intercourse. At a later period also we learn from the Epistles of St. Paul, that in Greece itself, and particularly in the corrupt city of Corinth, instances of this same vice had to be deplored. Some of the earliest races that inhabited Ireland—the Milesians, in particular—are believed to have come more or less directly from the East, and it is no wonder that they should have brought with them customs that were prevalent in the territory of their origin.

However this may be, the relentless monarch pursued his purpose without any respite. Entreaties, threats, promises, were all employed in turn, but with not the slightest effect, except to fill with sadness and affliction the soul of the pure virgin to whom they were addressed. When driven thus to

<sup>1</sup> Genesis xix.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings, xiii.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor., chap. v.

the extreme limits of distress, Dymphna was inspired, like Judith of old, to ask for a term of forty days, in order that she might consider maturely the proposals that had been made to her. This request having been readily granted, the King rejoiced when he saw his daughter occupied at the preparation of the ornaments of dress suitable to the nuptials of a person in her state. Such outward appearances were, however, only intended to cover the design which she had conceived, to fly from the peril.

In all her troubles, Dymphna found a wise and trustworthy guide in the person of the aged priest Gerebernus,<sup>1</sup> who had secretly converted her mother to the Christian faith, and who had watched over her own education and spiritual interests with the most paternal care. At the crisis which had now arrived, this faithful counsellor saw that flight alone could save Dymphna from the most miserable fate, and to this expedient the princess readily consented. Gerebernus himself was prevailed upon to accompany her to a place of safety,<sup>2</sup> whilst her father's court-jester and his wife, who were both Christians, and whose devotion could be relied upon, were taken into the secret, and agreed to follow her as attendants.

The small company of fugitives made their way to the sea-side, and took shipping to some foreign coast. It is not stated whether they passed through England on their journey outward; but in due course they landed at the port of Antwerp, in Belgium. Here they remained for a short time; but, anxious for greater solitude, they resolved to seek a quiet retreat in the country, and they proceeded inland as far as Gheel. Close to this town, in a quiet and secluded spot, then surrounded by dense woods and thickets, they

<sup>1</sup> Erat tunc temporis in Hybernia eximiae sanctitatis et doctrinae sacerdos quidam nomine Gerebernus, qui in illa gentilitate quos poterat ad dominum convertebat, reginaeque defunctae Christum colentis in hac vita, genitricis Sanctae Dymphnae, confessarius fuerat, ipsam quoque Dymphnam pridem baptizaverat et eam fidem Catholicam, sacramque scripturam docuerat. Denique ab illo regina defuncta et Dymphna ejus filia sacramentum Eucharistiae recipere consueverunt.

<sup>2</sup> Cum horam fugae opportunam nacta esset virgo sancta, adjunctis sibi Sancto Gereberno et joculari patris sui cum ejus uxore, ut sub jocularum specie secretius proficisci possent propositum iter ingressa est.

built themselves a house, in which, as their biographer tells us, they led an angelic life. They went regularly to the neighbouring church of St. Martin at Gheel, where Gerebernus celebrated Mass, and on their return the day was spent in prayer and other religious exercises. About the middle of July, 1892, we passed by this sacred spot, in company with the Abbé de Vel, the good "pastoor" of St. Dymphna's parish. A handsome little oratory now marks the spot in which the Irish virgin lived. Statues of the two saints are erected there on either side of the altar. At noon of the summer's day, the country all around was peaceful and still. The peasants were all occupied in the fields, and there was scarcely a sound to be heard on any side. We could imagine what it must have been when Dymphna and her companions selected it for their abode, and when the woods and thickets cut it off from the noise of the outer world.

The anger of the father, when he heard of Dymphna's departure, was utterly uncontrollable. He ordered the country to be searched high and low, in order to discover her hiding-place; and when he had found that she had already fled from the country, he fitted out a fleet to pursue her.

With a number of followers he traced her by different stages, till at last he landed at Antwerp, having evidently been informed of the course she had taken. From Antwerp he sent envoys through the surrounding country in the hope of finding some trace of her whereabouts. Some of these messengers, when paying for their food in Irish coin at the village of Westerloo, were informed that money of a similar stamp had recently been received from a young Irish lady, who, with an aged priest and two servants, was living in seclusion in the woods close by. This was the first clue which the pursuers had found, and it naturally led to almost immediate discovery.

The anger of the king, when brought face to face with the fugitives, fell chiefly on the venerable priest Gerebernus. When the courageous old man warned Dymphna, in the presence of her father, to be faithful to the spouse whom she had chosen, and to yield neither to the threats nor to the entreaties of the tyrant, he was ordered by the King to be



seized at once, taken away, and beheaded. These commands were instantly obeyed, and the foul deed was aggravated by almost every expression of hatred and contumely which furious passions could excite. The aged priest received with joy his glorious crown of martyrdom, and sealed with his blood the love of chastity and truth which distinguished him during life.

The infatuated monarch next employed all his powers of persuasion in endeavouring to induce his daughter to return with him to Ireland to share his kingdom, to be the pride of his people, and to have her statue placed amongst those of the goddesses that were still worshipped in his temples. But to all such inducements the answer of Dymphna was prompt and firm.<sup>1</sup> “With all my soul I despise thy kingly delights. I repudiate the honours thou desirest to confer upon me. It is useless to persist in thy entreaties.” Enraged at her steadfastness, the King had now recourse to threats of violence. “Do at once what I wish, or thou shalt incur thy father’s anger, like that malignant priest, Gerebernus, who has lost his head for his treachery. Spare thy own youth. Submit to thy father’s wishes. Sacrifice to our gods, or thou shalt die, and be an example to all who dare oppose our will.” Dymphna replied:<sup>2</sup> “O cruel tyrant! Didst thou kill the venerable priest of God, who was guilty of no crime? Know now that thou shalt not escape the judgment of the Almighty. Thy gods and goddesses I abhor and detest, and commit myself altogether to my Lord Jesus Christ, who is my spouse, my glory, my salvation, my hope, my desire. Whatever pain thou canst inflict, I shall bear with joy in fidelity to Him.”

Whilst listening to this uncompromising declaration, the King was overcome with passion. He saw that his plans were frustrated, that his labour had been spent in vain, that

<sup>1</sup> Tuas regales delicias tota mente contemno et honorem statuæ vilipendo. Talem mihi denceps noli frustra adhibere sermonem.

<sup>2</sup> Qua de causa, crudelis tyranne, occidisti egregium domini sacerdotem, nulli crimini affinem? Dei omnipotentis iudicium non evades. Dios, deasque tuas ut figmentum detestor et Domino Jesu Christo tota me devotione committo. Ille sponsus meus, gloria mea, salus mea, et desiderium meum, &c.

he should return to Ireland baffled and defeated in his project. In his frenzy nothing short of the death of his own daughter would satisfy him. To the miscreants who had already killed the faithful Gerebermus he issued the fatal order. But even *they* had too much regard for the youth and beauty and purity of the princess to obey him. They feared, moreover, that in calmer moments he would repent of his harshness, and that whosoever should dare to do injury to his daughter would become the victims of his altered mood. Seeing their unwillingness to act, the unhappy father drew his own sword from its scabbard, and wielding it high in the air, delivered the inhuman blow which deprived him for ever of his daughter, and added one more to the heavenly train that follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. It was thus that the blood of the Irish virgin was shed on the land of Gheel, and in presence of the crime we have only to repeat the words, in which, in after ages the inhabitants recorded their gratitude at the event:—

“O felix patria quam sacrat sanguine Dymphna.”

We have before us a long list of the miracles<sup>1</sup> by which, in the course of history, God showed His appreciation of the fidelity of His servants Dymphna and Gerebermus. Through them the divine life of the Church was manifested by graces of a special kind. It poured its compassion upon a class of human creatures who are, perhaps, more to be pitied than any other afflicted mortals in the world; namely, on those who, like the father of the virgin-martyr herself, had been deprived of the guiding light of reason. Even to this day a colony of poor demented creatures find refuge at Gheel, under the benign protection of the angelic virgin. At the foot of her altar they seem to yield to the influence of her memory, and to submit with unusual patience to the lot which Providence has designed for them. Whoever contrasts their treatment with that to which their fellow-sufferers are subjected in other lands, must admit that the ways of Catholic charity are wonderful indeed. For although

<sup>1</sup>The description of the miracles of St. Dymphna, down to the year 1655, occupies eleven folio pages in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists.

it is a pitiable sight to see them going about the streets with  
 "the noble mind o'erthrown"—

"Like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh."

Yet it is surely consoling to think that they are not altogether cut away from the society of their fellow-creatures, and that a ray, however faint, of earthly happiness may still shine, at intervals, on their existence.

But the blessings obtained through the influence of St. Dymphna were not confined to any class or section of the people. She is the patron saint of the whole district, known as the *Campine*; and in the year 1632 the bishop of the neighbouring diocese of Hertogensbosh in Holland, in a letter in which he exhorts his spiritual subjects to have constant recourse to the powerful protection of St. Dymphna, bears testimony to the innumerable favours, both spiritual and temporal, which the whole country had received through the influence of its virgin patron.<sup>1</sup> And what is still more important, several Popes, including John XXII., John XXIII., and Eugene IV., testified to her miracles in Apostolic letters.

The bodies of the two saints were religiously preserved together at Gheel for many centuries. So great was the veneration of the people for these relics, and so widespread the fame of their miracles, that when a great pilgrimage came from the distant town of Xanten, in Germany, in the Middle Ages, the men in their enthusiasm carried away the bodies of the two saints which they wished to have in their church. They were pursued, however, by the people of Gheel, and the contentions which followed resulted in a compromise by which the relics of St. Dymphna were restored to their owners, whilst those of Gerebernus were transferred to Xanten or Sonsbeek. The "pious robbers of Xanten" have since then a very bad reputation for honesty amongst

<sup>1</sup> "Hortamur omnes venerabiles dominos, clerum, drossardum, magistratum, gildas, omnesque incolas ut devotione speciali, hanc virginem martyrem ejusque sacras reliquias prosequantur et honorent, memores quod Deus optimus maximus, singulari sua providentia hanc eis patronam dederit et multis miraculis et benedictionibus, tum spiritualibus, tum temporalibus terram illam illustraverit ac perfunderit ac perfundet." *Actum in Geldorp, loco nostrae residentiae*, 24 Aprilis, 1632. Fr. Michael, Episcopus Buscoducensis.

the peasants of the "Campine." These, however, have not forgotten St. Gerebernus, and on the feast of St. Dymphna, his name is invariably associated with that of the Virgin.

" Dat dan de Christene Hieldin  
Sint Dymphna zii geprezen ;  
Die eene rijke Konigin  
In t'heidendom kon wezen  
En Gerebernus die door t' land  
Gepreekt heeft vele jaren  
En t' Christendom heeft voort-geplant  
In t' midden der gevaren."

The remains of St. Dymphna are preserved in a beautiful silver shrine designed in Gothic shape and exquisitely ornamented. There are many other memorials of the virgin-martyr at Gheel and in the surrounding country. The principal church in the town is dedicated to St. Dymphna. It is a handsome Gothic structure, with a nave and two aisles. The high altar is relieved by a reredos, showing in curious figures scenes from the life of the saint. At the back of this reredos is a large Gothic shrine containing the tombs in which SS. Dymphna and Gerebernus were first interred. The inscription indicates what is there :—

" Quod jacet hic intus dum transis pronus honora."

" Tumbae sanctorum Dymphnae sunt et Gereberni."

In the choir there is an interesting mausoleum of the family of the Counts de Merode-Westerloo. In it are buried John III., Baron of Merode, and his eldest daughter, Anna van Ghistelle, who founded the Chapter in St. Dymphna's church, in 1552. Over the choir there is a beautiful stained-glass window presented by the present Countess de Merode. Beneath it, under the shield of her family, the Princes of Arenberg, is inscribed the motto, "*Plus d'honneur que d'honneurs.*" Honours, however, have been no obstacle to honour in the family of Merode. Through many vicissitudes and revolutions they have preserved the faith of their fathers, firm and strong, under the shadow of St. Dymphna. Whenever the interests of the Church required faithful, discreet, and trustworthy service, they could always be relied upon, and at the end of a long line of statesmen



and soldiers the present Count holds the honourable position of Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Conservative and Catholic government of his country. From his castle at the little village of Westerloo, a long avenue, shaded by two splendid rows of lime trees, leads to the old historic monastery of Westerloo, where the sons of St. Norbert have always kept alive the memory of St. Dymphna. Nor is there any sign of this general devotion falling off. It is rather the other way. Several memorials of the martyrdom of St. Dymphna have recently been erected, and at the foot of one of these we noticed a Latin inscription the date of which speaks for itself.<sup>1</sup>

In Ireland there are several memorials of St. Dymphna. In the days of Colgan she was regarded as the patroness of the whole country of Orghialla or Orgiel in Ulster and Louth. The parish of Tydavnet,<sup>2</sup> in the Co. Monaghan, is said to have been originally consecrated to her; and there is a spot in the townland of Curraghwillan, in Cavan, which also seems to be associated with her name. Another church called Kill-Alga or Kildalkey, between Trim and Athboy, in the Co. Meath, was placed under the protection of St. Dymphna. Dr. Petrie, in his work on the *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland*,<sup>3</sup> says that he had in his possession the staff of the "Virgin and Martyr, Damhnad Ocheine, or Dymphna the Fugitive." It is to this "baculus" or staff that Colgan alludes when he speaks of the honour in which St. Dymphna was held by the gentry and people of Orgiel.<sup>4</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> In honorem Sanctorum Dymphnae et Gerberni hoc posuit monumentum Julianus de Vel, hujus Ecclesiae Parochus. Anno Domini MDCCCLXXIV.

<sup>2</sup> "Going over some old Gaelic proper names, it will be noticed that many proper names end in 'nuit;' e.g., Dealnuit, Damhnuit (St. Dymphna, hence Tydavnet, house of Dymna), Ciarnuit. 'Nuit' is a late and bad spelling for 'nait,' a frequent old Irish diminutive feminine ending, not only for proper names, but for ordinary nouns."—*Gaelic Journal*, May, 1893, page 205.

<sup>3</sup> Page 324.

<sup>4</sup> Existit in Orgialla Ultonie, Hiberniae perampla regione, celebre et in magno pretio et veneratione in hujus virginis memoriam monumentum quod "Bachull Damhnad" id est baculus S. Dymphnae appellatur quando enim non solum dynastae et nobiles illius regionis sed et plebei aliquid volunt jure jurando affirmare, per hunc baculum, tanquam certum veritatis asserendae sacramentum solent jurare.

later times the name of Dymphna has become more popular than it had been as a Christian name in Ireland. We are happy to contribute a word to the fame of the virgin-martyr who bore it, and to join in the honour which is paid her in Belgium and Holland.

J. F. HOGAN.

---

### THE NEW DICTIONARY OF HYMNS.<sup>1</sup>

INGENIOUS persons have utilized idle hours by collecting, or calculating, statistics touching the production of this huge work. With or without authority, and from data which are not stated, they have announced how many printers' proofs were issued; how many hundred pounds were spent upon postage stamps; how many thousand articles were written; how many million of leaden letters were set up for its completion. More germane to the contents of the book, they might have added, from the preparatory portion of it, that the *Dictionary* is a joint production of nearly two score of avowed coadjutors, and upwards of one thousand unnamed correspondents; that it deals with subject-matter written in two hundred languages and dialects; that, in so dealing, it uses the appalling number of eight hundred contractions, not one quarter of which are described in the Table of Abbreviations; and that the total number of Christian hymns amounts, in the judgment of the editor, to a number not less than four hundred thousand. It may suffice to make one further estimate, not yet tabulated, which may prove suggestive of thought to both reader and writer. The volume contains upwards of sixteen hundred pages of small type, in double columns, on large-size paper. The literary material which fills this wide space, if printed in a readable character, and if three pages be allowed for every two columns, would extend, perhaps, to

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionary of Hymns*. Edited by John Julian, M.A. London: John Murray, 1892.

five thousand pages of an ordinary octavo book. This vast amount of statement, fact, and opinion, in one division of literature, has to be critically examined in an estimate of limited length, in a monthly review.

The subject-matter of the *Dictionary*—the topic of hymns—is a fruitful, not to say an inexhaustible literary topic. Given any verifiable first line of a hymn, and these amongst others are questions which force themselves on the attention of the student. Is the verse anonymous or avowed? Is it, to adopt familiar words, ancient or modern? or, to employ the language of the book under review, is it, or is it not, in “common use”? Who was its author? what is its date? where did it see the light? how was it used, or was it used at all for singing? and in what collection or collections of hymns is it to be found? Is the hymn original or translated? If it be original, has it been tampered with by irresponsible editors, adapted, euphemistically so called; or, altered without, or even with, the extorted consent of its unlucky author? or, less inhumanly, has it been subtracted from: or, more barbarously, has it been added to, by some hymnodist made, not born? If it be a translated hymn, is the translation verbal, or paraphrastic, or merely imitative? Or is the translation from the original language, or—a very different thing—a rendering from, or a retranslation of, a translation? And, in either case, who else may have versified the same hymn, and with what results? If the author be modern, what may be known of his story? what more has he written, specially in verse? was he, or is he, Protestant or Catholic? was he of English blood, or did he spring from that other hymn-loving, hymn-singing race, of German extraction? If the source be ancient, does the hymn bear the stamp of Church authority? and, if so, when, and where, and how was it, and is it still employed in missal, office book, or otherwise? And, in the case of any definite hymn, do various readings exist—for even English hymns are now old enough, and have been altered often enough, to bear critical textual inquiry? and what may be the true text, and where may it be found? And is the true text sufficiently rare, curious, or valuable to warrant its being restored and

reprinted; or, are the variations sufficiently important to bear contrasting, annotating, or quotation?

These questions are not framed at hap-hazard. On the contrary, they are categorically and systematically framed, with a definite purpose. They form a portion of the questions which, apart from the intrinsic importance, poetry, rhythm, or devotion of the hymn—often the last features observed by the professorial collector—demand, and may expect, an answer at the hands of the lexicographer. And these, and others too numerous to name, are the questions, more or less exactly, which duly receive a reply, in the case of a multitude of hymns, of their authors, of their surroundings, in the handsome and portly volume, the title of which stands above. Nor are these, by a long way, the only moot, or disputable, points in the new and almost scientific treatment of hymnody to which this *Dictionary* offers either a partial or a complete solution, or, at the least, a patient inquiry, or an intelligent criticism. Superficial and recondite matters, curious and interesting facts, questions of authorial difficulty or textual doubt, and various other aspects of the many-sided, and, to some persons, the engrossing, subject of hymns, critical, chronological, historic, linguistic, poetic, or musical—all are treated in turn. Indeed, a cursory survey only of the literary expanse exhibited within the range of Mr. Julian's gigantic undertaking is a proof that the statement with which these remarks opened is a moderate statement—the topic of hymnody is a fruitful topic.

The *Dictionary of Hymns* is a volume which owes its origin not less to the energy and assiduity of the editor and his fellow-workers, to the liberality of the publisher, and to the technical skill of the printer—three elements deserving recognition—than to the age in which they all live. Such a mass of facts and figures, of names and dates, of volumes, pages, and paragraphs quoted and referred to, could only with infinite difficulty have been produced at all, still less have been produced with comparative accuracy, without assistance from the material developments of the latter half of the present century. The result is a conspicuous literary combination, illustrating the harmonious working of capital



with labour, of means with intellect. Whosoever, be the name personal or a noun of multitude, may be credited with the inception, elaboration, and completion of the plan, or whosoever may be responsible for the subdivision and allotment of the various portions of it, and their subsequent amalgamation into a systematic and unified whole, the result, in the main, must be pronounced to be eminently workman-like. The company of hymnographers have to be, and are, by one of the last and least of their reviewers, heartily congratulated on the conclusion of their labour of love and their work of years. That their work and labour do not lie beyond the reach of fair and just criticism in many departments of it, and even of severe criticism in some of them, need not detract from a sincere expression of well-merited appreciation of their efforts. Of course, if such criticism be not undeserved, if, indeed, in the interests of literature, it be imperatively demanded, the value of certain parts, and to a like extent the value of the entire volume, is proportionately diminished. Of course, too, another consideration has weight; and this serves at once as an excuse and reason for venturing to criticise freely so important and valuable a literary creation.

In the nature of things, a book composed as the *Dictionary* has been composed, by many independent writers, and of numberless self-contained articles, is more patient of minute strictures, and is more open to practical amendment, than a book on one subject, by one author. As facts beyond dispute, the writers do not stand on one intellectual or scholar-like level; the quality of their work varies with the individuality of the writer, or with the requirements or difficulties of his subject. But, in any case, this is a first attempt on so grand a scale to treat hymnody, even if somewhat less scientifically, at least as something more than the mere writing, translating, selection, editing, and publishing sacred verse. It is an attempt to collect, to classify, to annotate in outline, by their first words or in relation to their purport and intent, individually and generically, the hymns of the English-speaking world. Not, however, that the aims of the *Dictionary* is confined by such insular

bounds, as will be seen by-and-bye, though, perhaps, for its consistency in design, it ought to have been, for its range is far wider. It is an attempt to compress within the compass of a single volume the results of hymnological research and inquiry, conducted by experts, from all available sources, published or MS., in many languages, living and dead, in many libraries, at home and abroad. As an honest attempt alone, this great work of Mr. Julian should be frankly welcomed in a sympathetic and generous temper. Its merits should be admitted with ungrudging praise, specially by those who are fellow-students with himself, or who practically and by experience are not ignorant of the difficulties inseparable from his editorial labours. Its very failures and shortcomings, however candidly and freely noted—to be of service the notes should be both free and candid—should be treated with considerate leniency. The book, however, is very much more than an attempt. The *Dictionary of Hymns* is a monument, not of genius, nor of talent, for there is no scope at all for such gifts; nor even of scholarship in a marked degree, except in limited areas and in special topics, for there is little need for more than the elements of a liberal education in the treatment of hymnody. But, in this superficial age of scamped labour, and work that is not the worker's best, it is a monument of hard, conscientious literary labour, and of competent ability to cope with it; of labours within well-defined, though wide, limits of investigation, which oftentimes are difficult of access. It is, moreover, a monument of indefatigable industry and care exhibited in the smallest details, and of indomitable perseverance and energy, continued, apparently, unimpaired to the very last page of the book. It is a monument which well deserves to be crowned with success, as well literary as material, and a success which there is cause to suppose has been already abundantly secured.

In what manner and to what extent it were both possible and convenient to deal critically with such an encyclopædic collection of hymnological lore in the space at disposal, was a problem by no means easy to solve. After some thought, the

plan which seemed to conduce less vaguely than others to the interests of the subject under discussion, may be gathered from what follows. The *Dictionary of Hymns* has been received by the Press with an almost unanimous chorus of applause. The writer is far from saying that such applause was not honestly deserved. Indeed, he was thankful to be able to throw up his cap amongst the crowd; and he is still more pleased personally to avow his sense of the value of the book, and his concurrence in the meed of praise with which it was received. The approval betowed upon the work has been almost as unstinted as unexceptioned, by such varied organs of literary opinion as the *Times*, the *Spectator*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Guardian*, the *Athenæum*, the *Scottish Review*, and others; and in such commendations he gladly joins, though not always in the unconditioned terms occasionally employed. Under these circumstances, it seemed needless to re-echo, with whatever vigour of repetition or variety of phrase, the panegyrics poured upon the volume. Rather, it appeared, that he would take the part of a true friend of the science of hymnody, who, according to his ability, should fairly and without prejudice take the part of a not unfriendly censor, and carefully indicate what he thought the chief failings in the work, and in what way its main defects might be remedied. Of course, the candid friend is a character not usually appreciated by those towards whom he acts the sometimes invidious part. Still, it may be of benefit to the cause both have at heart, that the one should speak, and the other should listen. Anyway, the course indicated will be here adopted; and it will be adopted without a shadow of a shade of censoriousness, in all simplicity and good faith. Indeed, the *Dictionary*, in the person of certain of its contributors, has dealt with such generosity in discussing some of the hymn-theories of the present writer, and in acknowledging his small service rendered to one division of hymnody, that it would be impossible for him to treat in any other spirit the work of fellow-labourers on a grander scale, and in more important spheres than those to which he aspires. With these preliminary words of *apologia*, a critical

estimate of some portions of the *Dictionary* may be attempted.<sup>1</sup>

An imperfect, but frank expression of opinion having been given on some of the merits of the *Dictionary of Hymnology*, equal frankness may be employed in speaking, perhaps even more imperfectly, of what may be deemed some of its demerits, or rather some of its chief faults. It is seldom given to any man to excel in every department of his calling in life. Average merit in certain phases, with pre-eminence in one of them, is the most that can be expected of powers that fall short of genius. Rightly to gain the credit of having first planned, and then executed so far-reaching and invaluable a work, even with the co-operation of others, ought to be praise sufficient for any editor. To expect from such a one, in addition, other and more common-place, though essential editorial qualifications, is not altogether reasonable. The gifts of diction and style, for instance, and the more needful power of criticising the style and diction of others, are, perhaps, too much to look for. Neither is a dictionary the field in which the elegancies of literature, apart from scholarship in possessing, or lucidity in conveying knowledge, are usually cultivated with success, though their presence adds charm and grace to the dry facts and hard judgments which it enshrines. Evidences exist, and can be quoted, which tend to show that neither gift is specially marked in the editor's work, whether exhibited in his own case, or exerted on behalf of his staff. The articles, in short, are not always written in plain, terse, idiomatic, nor even, occasionally, in grammatical English. There are noteworthy, and almost brilliant exceptions. But many of

<sup>1</sup>The editor of the *Dictionary* will not, it is hoped, misunderstand the above allusion to certain of his articles and statements connected with the poets Dryden and Drummond, and their relation to certain translations of old Catholic hymns. In spite of arguments advanced in the *Dictionary* to the contrary, the present writer is still of opinion that the two series of hymns in question, viz.—the hymns in the *Prætor* of 1706, and in the *Primer* of 1615—were written by Dryden, and were not written by Drummond severally. He hopes and dares to be allowed to restate his judgment on these points with not less courtesy than has been shown to himself and his theories by Mr. Julian and some of his contributors.



the papers contain words and expressions which ought to have been wisely and silently corrected by a discreet editor. Some contain mere irrelevant surplusage, which should have been ruthlessly eliminated by a severe censor. And a few contain passages which are perilously near akin to absolute obscurity. An outsider cannot look behind the scenes, and gauge the very nice relations which sometimes subsist between the principal worker and his nominal subordinates, who, in their several spheres may really be dominant. Neither can the critic be assured how far superficial faults may be due to the original imperfection of the plan, or to the results of a good plan having been unhappily abandoned. The alteration of a scheme, under the plea of improvement, without a due sense of symmetry and proportion being retained, almost necessitates deterioration in a literary effort. The *Dictionary* seems to avow, what is clear from the study of it, that it has been the victim of self-evolution—not always developed on its original lines. Its fulfilment, apparently, has outgrown the project, if not the originator; and that, in far more important aspects than those already hinted at.

Be this as it may, there exists much in the volume which bears the impress either of positive deficiency, or of needless excess, or of want of grasp of the position, or of thorough misarrangement of good materials collected with infinite trouble, and arranged with only not endless labour. The features in the *Dictionary* to which exception is thus taken may be due, not to oversight, for the editor may be more keenly alive to defects in his work than the critic; nor to error of judgment, wherein the former may be the superior of the latter. They may ensue from the natural course of the inevitable. As a fact, however, the *Dictionary* suffers both in perfection of plan and utility of reference from, at least, four palmary defects, all of which are exaggerated, if they do not take their rise from editorial shortcomings. These four failings assume the following form to the mind of the present writer:—

First, the arrangements of the work generally, and in many of its details, for the use of the average reader, whose

capacity, or incapacity, the reviewer is morally bound to consider, is radically bad.

Second, the absence of any clue to the main object and scope of the volume, as well as of any guide to its practical use, is more than suggestive of the absence of any definite plan at the outset, or of its abandonment at a subsequent date. And this want is heartrending to the critic.

Thirdly, for the student, the grave and startling omissions from the compilation, in spite of its otherwise comprehensive character—and taking the title-page of the *Dictionary* literally, at its own estimate—are seriously damaging to the completeness of what professes to be, and to a large extent in some directions actually is, an exhaustive work.

Whilst, lastly, precious and irretrievably lost space in the volume has been recklessly wasted either in questionably valuable, or in unquestionably valueless, literary matter. And this fault has been committed in regard both to minute and trivial details, which do not enhance the worth of the book to any intelligent reader; and also, to long, wordy, and irrelevant discussions, which justly detract from its excellence.

These four faults can only be dealt with in this place with brevity. The remarks to be made are the digested results of painstaking and diligent analysis—not of the whole work, for that were impossible in the space at command for their statement, but of wide and varied portions of it, so far as opportunity permitted. Two preliminary cautions may be offered in self-defence, or by way of explanation, for venturing to censure the joint production of so many and such capable authors on a common subject:—(1) It is possible, in a work of which the predominant features are not ever those of method and order, that facts and opinions which ought to be, but are not, found in one department and under one heading, may yet be successfully sought elsewhere. And (2) the writer is conscious that greater research, more time and more talent, has been of necessity devoted to the task of construction (if the workers be worthy of their salt), than, in the nature of things, and through the

division of labour, could be applied to the more facile task of annotation. Hence, all his criticisms are offered with becoming diffidence, though the form of them be magisterial; and none will be more pleased than the reviewer, if his strictures may be shown to be mistaken. To these prefatory remarks one more, of personal moment, may be hazarded. Although, from circumstances over which the writer has had no control, this appreciation will be published comparatively late in the day; and though he has read a considerable number of reviews of the *Dictionary* in the pages or columns of contemporary serials, yet much of the text was written, and nearly all the notes on which it is based were made, previously to his consulting the criticism of any other. The estimate, in fact, be it right or wrong, is an independent one; and two sentences may suffice to convey to the reader, in general terms, and before any detailed criticism is attempted, the writer's judgment upon the whole position. The editor of the *Dictionary* has conquered, with almost unexceptional success, the mechanical and literary particulars of his large undertaking. He has been almost equally mastered by the principles, and practical deductions from them, which ought to have governed at once his book, his contributors, and himself. And this want of success is, perhaps, more patent to one who is free from, than to any or to all who may be connected with, the organisation and its development.

I. In the first place, it is submitted, the arrangement of this over-bulky volume is at once imperfect and faulty, both in general and in particular; some of its contents need to be re-set, and some to be repeated under fresh conditions. These defects are noticeable under several aspects. Speaking broadly, it may be boldly affirmed that, after the example of Daniel, Mone, and others, the dictionary which is to live must consist of more than a single volume. To approach perfection in plan, the work should be divided into three parts. Lovers of hymns, librarians both public and private, and the wealthy, who alone, as a rule, can possess the book, and will buy it once in a life-time, would more readily give three guineas than than two guineas now. Of these three

hypothetical volumes, the last should contain the indices only, supplemented as will be suggested by-and-bye. The other two volumes should divide between them the text of the work; *e.g.*, the biography and history, the essays and monographs, as well as the more elaborate papers on various topics which are now discussed, should be placed in the first volume; and in the second should appear the shorter articles, including the catalogue of hymns, under some well re-considered system of sequence, and annotated more or less fully as they are at present treated. With a slightly enlarged type, which is painfully demanded by the student, in the indices (and a plea may be made on behalf of a thicker, less transparent, and tougher paper), each of the three volumes would probably exhibit equal dimensions. Next: in the event of financial reasons being prohibitive of the plan of three volumes, some re-construction of materials should be attempted even in the present literary edifice. This would not be hard to devise, though additional indices would be required, one for each language included in the work, and though a re-consideration of the headings of the articles should be necessitated. At this moment, two defects in method are obvious. Articles and essays that are pages in length jostle and overshadow paragraphs that fill a fraction only of a page, or even a line or two. And more vexing still is the fact, that in one consecutive stream of contribution, long and short, the headings appear in Babel-like confusion of tongue, dead or living, world-wide in use or rarely heard. For instance: Greek, Latin, German and English, fill the main portion of the work; and, in the index of first lines are occasionally found Bohemian and Polish, Samoan, Japanese and Burmese, Italian and French, Syriac, Greenlandic and Welsh. The first lines of the few hymns that are abnormal and exceptional in the *Dictionary*, and are named merely as curiosities, and by way of specimens, have no right to a place in such a catalogue. In justification of this criticism, it may be added that, amongst other first lines there may be found at least, and perhaps more than, one from the Polish; three from the Syriac; four from hymns sung by the Eskimoes (and these are only translations



from the English, and hence critically valueless); a like number, more or less, from the French and Italian; a few odd examples from the Welsh, and from an imperfect collection of Bohemian hymns. These hymnological exotics should have been conspicuous by their absence from the general index. Their presence combines the maximum of uniformity with the minimum of utility. Indeed, the hymns of each civilized tongue should have been catalogued apart, if not treated apart: and additional indices, together with a careful system of cross-references, would have rendered easy all minor difficulties. Conceive of a polyglot word-and-phrase lexicon in four different languages only, printed under similar conditions, in one long flow of paragraphs; and the reader may realise, by the aid of an avowed exaggeration, the vice of the present system of cataloguing hymns and their first lines.

A criticism of an important matter may be made on the treatment which Latin hymns receive in the pages of the *Dictionary*, in regard to their arrangement in alphabetical order. Without personal verification a student will hardly credit the statement, that there exist not fewer than eight different lists—or rather ten in all, if the index and the pages of the work itself be included—in which old Catholic hymns and sequences may be sought, and it must be added, (under certain conditions which could be named) may be sought in vain. It will not be amiss definitely to state them. The eight catalogues will be found under the following headings:—Breviaries (an article which contains two lists); Hymnarium (which has two); Latin, Translation from, and Notker Balbulus (each of which contains one catalogue); and Sequences (divided into two parts). Granting that these eight catalogues ought, on scientific grounds, to have been printed, an assumption not always warranted by the contents of the lists, yet the *Dictionary* desiderates one general and exhaustive catalogue of all the Latin hymns it names, or with which it deals. The separate lists might have been added with advantage, by way of supplement; but a single alphabetical catalogue of those hymns in the sacred tongue, which are permitted to appear in the

*Dictionary*, should certainly not have been omitted. And this essential element might fitly form a feature in the third hypothetical volume spoken of above. In this connection, it may be suggested that a ninth short catalogue would have added another degree of perfection to the department of Latin hymnody. This list might have contained the sequences composed by, or attributed to, Adam of St. Victor, the entire series of which has been translated by one of the contributors, the late Mr. Wrangham. In this list, also, might have been indicated the amount of authenticity which, in the judgment of the editor, adheres to each several sequence bearing the honoured name of the chief singer of the abbey of St. Victor. Unfortunately, Mr. Wrangham's English version was issued just before the second, greatly improved edition of Leon Gautier's work was published; and, by a strange oversight, the *Dictionary* apparently fails to note the results in this direction—although made public upwards of eleven years ago (albeit in the second appendix it records the fact)—of the later researches of M. Gautier.

A more serious fault appears in the false system, as it seems to the writer, which has been adopted in the *Dictionary* for cataloguing the names, with or without biographies, of the authors, translators, or editors of hymns, and the titles of their hymn-books. Of course, the main catalogue of hymns and authors is contained, in alphabetical sequence, in the body of the book itself. But, curiously enough, and with much want of method, and very confusingly to the reader, there are printed also many supplementary lists of names of authors scattered up and down the volume. And the entities of which these secondary lists are composed, are to be found, and often are to be found only, in the isolated catalogues, sectarian or specific, local or national, in which they appear, and not in the main portion of the work. It is thus made difficult to ascertain whether or not a certain hymnodist is favoured—and in many cases the nominal or biographical decision seems to hang upon favour—with a place and a story, however brief, in the *Dictionary*; and in any case, a double reference may be required before this fact can be established by the student. This erroneous system

dominates the whole of the book, and overruns its limits into the appendix.

The want of unity of plan and comprehensiveness in treatment here indicated, affects nearly every section of hymnody. Amongst others, may be specially mentioned the record of authors' names in the articles on Bohemian and on Moravian hymnology, on English Psalters, and on the Old Version of the Psalms, and on French and Welsh hymnology in the work itself; and on the Italian and Dutch sections in the appendix. In the paper upon American hymnody, again, are to be found ten denominational lists of hymn writers, and not one general catalogue. The history of German hymnody is divided into six distinct periods, each of which contains lists of authors, either named only with their dates, or annotated more or less concisely; but no common and all-containing catalogue of German hymnodists has been compiled. The like is true of the article on the Church of England contribution to the general stock of sacred lyrics for public worship; and herein, as touching the reader more nearly, the imperfection of the system under review becomes more marked. In this essay the history of Anglican hymnody is sketched in four-and-twenty columns, from the year 1700 to the present day. It is divided into six periods; and each section contains the names of hymn-writers and the titles of hymnals which were published in the various eras. The authors and translators placed on record in these pages, number two hundred and fifty at the most, the editor says; and the number of hymn-books published reaches beyond two hundred and fifty. Each several section contains its own list of writers and editors; the six periods contain not fewer than eleven catalogues of books, arranged according to their dates; but, again, no comprehensive index includes them all, whether they be books or writers.

II. Of the organic design of the book—conceding there was a design, and that the articles do not represent a fortuitous concourse of literary atoms, arranged in alphabetical order—and of its systematic evolution, what was actually aimed at, and what in theory has been attained, we are left

in ignorance. Indeed, any criticism on the scope or plan of the *Dictionary* presupposes a constructive power on the part of the reviewer which, if the result does not represent the design of the editor, the blame, from lack of information, lies with the last, and not with the first named. Such an ideal would include, at the least, over and above a definite plan of work, proportion in execution, similarity of treatment, adaptation of means to end, and a spirit of congruity by which like writers are allotted to like subjects. That such have been guiding principles in the compilation of the *Dictionary*, we are not assured. It is true, there has been printed a very full title-page—yet wanting one important word; a table of contents; lists of contributors and of MSS. consulted or used; four columns of abbreviations and their explanation; together with an editorial statement of two pages, printed in large type. These elements exhaust the amount of editorial matter addressed, for his guidance and information, to the reader. And these elements are altogether insufficient for their purpose. For, to speak plainly, the preface fails to take a comprehensive view of the hymn position treated lexicographically; fails to announce the editor's base of operation, or to indicate the contributor's line of treatment; fails to convey to the inquirer any gloss upon the method, with its developments and limitations, which hypothetically must have been adopted; fails to afford any hint to the student how practically to employ, with the largest amount of benefit and least amount of labour, the almost overwhelming mass of hymnological knowledge which is contained within the binding of the book. For, it must not be forgotten, that the work under consideration is only a *Dictionary* in a wide sense of the term. Clearly it is not a lexicon that is comparable to an ordinary French and English dictionary, or to a glossary of geological or ecclesiastical terms. It more nearly approaches the character and dimensions of an encyclopædia; yet, unlike a well-conditioned unit of that family, such as the *Britannica*, it does not afford an alphabetical index of contents, nor a list of the author's contributions. Nor must it be forgotten, that so far as his volume departs from the ordinary form of the



genus to which it belongs, to the like extent Mr. Julian was bound to indicate its variations and to defend its peculiarities. In the place of these precautionary measures on behalf of the reader, this monster work is launched upon the waters of publicity apart from all adventitious aids. It consists of a miscellaneous collection of sentences, paragraphs and articles, varying in length from one line to many pages, on almost all conceivable hymnological subjects, duly following in many tongues the lead of the English alphabet. Indeed, it would be difficult to discover what hymn topic it has failed to notice, so wide is the range of its far-reaching scope, and so thorough has been the subdivisions of materials for work.

For instance, and with no pretence to exhaust the topics, a few may be noted. The *Dictionary* includes the identification of authors by their signatures; catalogues of hymn-books and their editors; lists of Latin and other hymns; the first lines of English hymns; biographical memoirs and short notices of hymnodists of many races and beliefs; essays in hymnody, comparative and other; the history of national and denominational hymns, with geographical excursions; critical estimates and textual discussions on hymns selected, perhaps arbitrarily, for their value, beauty, or extensive use, of many ages and languages; and statistics of divers kinds, curious facts, and out-of-the-way information on the common subject of discussion. Such a comprehensive scheme, with scarcely an obvious beginning, and with no logical ending, demanded an equally explicit statement of principle of operation, and of result attained. But a statement of neither can be found. Fully to sustain this charge, the preface should be produced. But, as the preface occupies only a couple of pages, there is no serious danger of error; and if error be made, it may promptly be detected. Two short paragraphs alone, it is contended, form a partial exception to this stricture—viz., the eighth and ninth of the preface. Yet, these merely touch the fringe of the want above described. They only tell us that the *Dictionary* treats hymnologically countries, periods, languages, and authors—points which had been anticipated, or might be taken for granted from the wording

of the title-page. And, further, it declares that the key-note to the work treated linguistically is our mother tongue—a point neither literally in harmony with the wording of the same initial page, when it speaks of the hymns of all ages and nations, nor congruous with a large portion of the contents of the volume, which discuss hymns never yet translated into our language, and hymn-books themselves being translations into other languages from the vernacular. Indeed, had one of two courses been adopted—neither of which have been taken—the advantage to all concerned would have been marked. Either the adjective “English,” by way of qualification, might have appeared in some combination, which need not be specified on the title-page, and the contents of the volume have been confined by this limitation; or, the present title (including the words “all ages and nations”) being employed, the contents of the volume might have been levelled up to the height assumed by its practical universality. In the first case, the limitation would have been by no means narrow, if translations into English were, as they have been, included in the term. In the second case, universality would have been less remotely escaped, had the various national and linguistic sections of hymnody been treated in a more Catholic temper and spirit, using the adjective in both its religious and secular sense. This last defect will be illustrated later on.

Meanwhile, the title-page of the *Dictionary* stands between the horns of the above-named dilemma. Strictly speaking it is inadequate to the occasion. What was really needed, by way of finger-post to an intending traveller over the vast expanse of hymnody mapped in this volume, was a plain, straightforward, matter-of-fact statement, however short, of the course the editor meant to take, the end which the writers hoped they had reached, and the means which the reader must adopt in order to avail himself of the common labour. Such a literary canon, by whomsoever written, should have been made; and the editor should have rigorously exacted its provisions from his contributors. Inflexible rules of composition have been made and can be enforced; and there would have been no difficulty to indicate

to the student the results, or some of them, which he might expect to find in the pages of the *Dictionary*. In the place, however, of a general law carefully adhered to, and only abandoned upon sufficient cause and after due warning, many, perhaps all, of the contributors seem to have been blessed, or banned, with a free hand. Anyway, they have in effect followed their own individual devices and predilections, not to say their own personal fancies and prejudices. The consequent absence of a common harmony in treatment, of a common method in arrangement, of a common proportion in dealing with details, perhaps even of a common design in the original conception, is only too conspicuous in the *Dictionary*. It almost seems as if, in the first place, the initial plan had proved all too narrow to include the wealth of material which ever multiplied with the growth of the work; and, eventually, as if the work had suddenly developed at too great a speed, and had to be summarily checked, even at the cost of acknowledged imperfection. It is certainly true, not only that elements of which the lexicographical scheme is naturally patient have not been included; but also, that subdivisions of the work to which allusion is made in an earlier part of the volume, have found no place in the latter part; and that, for instance, a useful index promised and referred to in the text is not provided at the end of the book. But, more than this, and worse than this, from a critical point of view, has to be said. In every department of hymnody, and in all the details of each several portion, evidences of undisciplined and unchecked authorial licence exist. No two questions, in different parts of the book, by different hands, are discussed in a similar form, manner, or proportion; and hardly any two contributors appear to be influenced by the same leading idea, or principle, or to be controlled by the like methods of composition, compilation, quotation, or reference.

These criticisms are far from being random assertions. Though it be impossible within the limits of a review-article to substantiate each assertion, each assertion is based upon what the writer believes to be a foundation; and the remarks offered are defensible by notes collected by laborious

search and collated with close comparison. If, however, the writer be challenged to afford an instance of a paper whose contents justifies his strictures, on the absence of plan and method in the volume, of the neglect of editorial supervision in the composition of an article, and of irreconcilable divergences, in form and manner, between itself and other more workmanlike and critical performance, he need only point to the article on Foreign Missions. And here it may be premised that the opinion formed on the paper, and the following criticism of it, were written before the present writer was aware of the death of the author, and of the circumstances under which the paper was composed. Whilst, then, he would prefer to be silent on this article, and desires to be respectful and kind to the memory of the author, he is bound to be, as he considers, just. Perhaps the better plan would be to visit the literary sins of the essay on the editor, and to dismiss the personality of the contributor from consideration. However, the article is one of the longest in the volume, and is one of the most diffuse and rambling. It contains a record of the efforts in hymnody of twelve sectarian missionary societies, American and English, which are sufficiently well known to be indicated by the initials of their titles, and of others of less wide repute, whose names are printed in full length. The efforts in hymnody chronicled by this article are, of course, praiseworthy in themselves; are not without interest to the reader; are garnished with endless literary attractions; and, perhaps, under conditions, deserve a record in such a work as the *Dictionary*. But, even the last opinion will be a moot point to the student when he discovers what may be the material of which the essay is constructed. The hymns that form the staple of this article are not the hymns of the various and different nations and tribes which constitute, so to speak, the hunting-ground of the missionary societies. As such, they would logically demand admittance into a hymn lexicon. Rather, they are mostly, and, so far as the reader is visibly assured, entirely, nothing more than translations into the several languages of the heathen people described, of the very hymns about which the major part of the remainder of the book is concerned; viz., English hymns.



From this point of view, and it is a legitimate standpoint to take, this long-drawn and wearisome article, containing nothing which adds to our stock of information, historically, critically, or devotionally, on the science of hymns, finds its place, by an inexcusable mistake, in Mr. Julian's scholarlike and learned *Dictionary*. Nothing material is added, hymnologically, beyond the fact that certain hymns which are usually indicated by the number contained in the volume, or by the number of pages they fill, have been translated into certain modern languages, savage or civilized. Such facts of a hymnological character, beyond those of enumeration, which this paper includes, might reasonably have formed the basis of a brief paper to describe, to explain when needful, and to annotate a tabulated statement of hymns, translations and translators, done from the English for missionary purposes. But it is an intolerable waste of space that the inapposite and irrelevant matter of which the article is mainly composed, should be forced, at an inordinate length, into the *Dictionary*. The science of hymnody, and our relation towards it, are unaffected by geographical facts, by measurements of distances, by statistics of population, by the natural and picturesque features of foreign scenery, by the physical conformation of the savages for whom the hymns are translated, by the philological peculiarities of tongues which have created no hymns, or by the domestic relations of a commonplace kind touching those who effected the translations, or by endless petty details of a similar non-hymnological character. That the article in question contains matter no more cognate to hymnody than is indicated by such trumpery minutiae, is not pretended. That it indisputably contains much more of a similar character, beyond what has been described, is a fact—a fact which warrants the censure which has been deservedly passed upon this singularly unfortunate article.

Criticism on the other two points selected for notice must be deferred to another occasion.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

## DEPORTATION OF THE IRISH TO THE WEST INDIES IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

MR. PRENDERGAST, in his *Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*—a work, the value of which to any one who wishes to know something of the history of the latter half of the seventeenth century can hardly be exaggerated—touches in a passing way on certain matters well deserving of more detailed treatment than the limits of his work allowed. Of these not the least interesting is the deportation of the Irish to the West Indies about that time. Cardinal Moran, in his introduction to the *Life of Oliver Plunkett*, has given some extracts from documents in the Roman archives, describing the manner in which these poor people were deported, and the hardships which they endured in their exile. These and a few short references in contemporary authors contain nearly all that has been written on the subject hitherto. I would complete the narrative, so far as may be, from other sources, and chiefly from the Government Records, which only in these later times have been made accessible to students.

There is in the Rolls' Office in Dublin a series of volumes bearing the title of "General Orders." They are the diaries of the Council, sitting in Dublin Castle day by day to determine what should be done in detail in the government of the country, orders to public officers, replies to petitions, &c., each signed T. H., C.C., Thomas Herbert, Clerk of the Council. In the volume marked A, containing the Diaries of the years 1654-55, we find a case given in greater detail than any other, which will show the manner in which justice was administered then, and who they were who were sent into exile.

Midway between Kildare and Monasterevan, there is a townland called Lackagh. On the roadside there are still remains of an old castle, one of the many small keeps built in that part of the country soon after the English invasion. Towards the end of the fifteenth century this was inhabited by Sir Thomas Fitzgerald, second son of Thomas, seventh

Earl of Kildare, who was Chancellor of Ireland, and fell in the battle of Stoke, fighting for Lambert Simnel. On a tombstone in the churchyard at Kildare there is a raised figure of a knight in armour, and an inscription bearing the name of his grandson, who is there said to be of Lackagh. This was, therefore, the family residence of this branch of the Kildare family. A murder of two Protestant soldiers took place here in the early part of 1655. Here is the Order issued by the Council in relation to it :—

“Whereas by Declaration bearing date the 18th April last, Itt was declared (in order to y<sup>e</sup> prevention of many Murthers, Rapins, Thefts, Burnings, and Spoyles y<sup>e</sup> were Comonly done and committed on y<sup>e</sup> poore Inhabitants of this nation) that watch and ward, Hue and Cry, should be duly kept and observed in all the Provinces of Ireland, according to law and the many Declarations formerly published to that purpose putt in execution; and whereas this Board is informed that there hath been A Barbarous murther lately committed in the County of Kildare upon Denis Brennan and Mortagh Turner, Protestants (and persons lately in y<sup>e</sup> service of the State and pay of the army) at the Castle of Lackaigh in the said county to the Terror of the rest of the Peaceable Inhabitants. It is ordered that Coll. John Hewson, Major Anthony Morgan, and Lieut. Coll. Hewettson, or any two of them, do forthwith repaire unto the said place where the fact was done, and secure all the Inhabitants thereof, and inform themselves by all due ways and means how the said murder was committed and by whom, and that they doe send for all such partyes and examine such witnesses as they shall think fitt upon oath touching the manner thereof, and how the said murtherers may be discovered and apprehended. And whether they have not Abbettors, Harbourers, and Countenancers that are of their friends, kindred, or others in the same Towne or County. And upon due inquiry in the whole matter of ffact they the said Colonel Hewson, &c., or any of them, are to cause all the Irish inhabitants of the said town where the said murther was committed (that are of the Popish religion) to be sent under safeguard unto Waterford, to y<sup>e</sup> end they may be speedily transported to y<sup>e</sup> Barbadoes or some other of the Plantacion Islands belonging to his Highness and to the Commonwealth in America. And that they also commit to the next Gaole all such others as they shall suspect to have been either Principals or accessarys or otherwise Abettors to the murther aforesaid, to be kept in safe custody untill they be delivered by due course of Law; they are also to examine witnesses upon oath concerning the same, and to bind them over by Recognizance to prosecute on

behalf of his Highness and the Commonwealth. And that in the meantime the said Colonel Hewson, &c., or any two of them cause their respective estates to be inventoryed and secured, and so return an amount of their proceedings herein unto this Board with all convenient speed.

“Dated at the Castle of Dublin this 22 October, 1655.”

Then come three orders in reference to this matter. The first bids the Attorney-General “peruse the examinations taken as above, and certify to the Board whom he conceives proceedings may be taken against.” The next, dated October 25th, orders “an allowance of four pence per diem to be given to each of the prisoners.” The third, dated November 6th, orders “Colonel Hewton and Captain Markam to examine the prisoners brought up to Dublin to be tried, and any witnesses they may think fit, and to return their evidence to the Council.”

Meantime Connor Byrne, Tiede Moran, James Beacen, and Terlagh Dunn, were tried for high treason before the Lord Justice at the Four Courts in Dublin, and condemned. The Court ordered that “Byrne and Moran shall be safely conveyed to the town of Lackagh, and from there to be drawn upon a dray or hurdle into ye gallows or place of execution near thereunto erected, and there hanged up, and their heads cut off, and the members of their bodies disposed of as shall be thought fit.” The Council, however, remitted the part of the sentence that ordered their bodies to be quartered.

Now we come to the other inhabitants of the town, *i.e.* townland, all of whom, be it remembered, that were “Irish and Popish,” were seized, to be sent to Waterford and thence to the Barbadoes.

“Ordered that Philip Peak, Esq., Marshall of y<sup>e</sup> four Courts at Dublin, doe forthwith upon receipt hereof deliver or cause to be delivered unto Captain Robert Coleman Commander of y<sup>e</sup> Wexford Frigate all such Popish priests (other than such as are committed for murder) as also the persons brought out of y<sup>e</sup> County of Kildare and committed to his custody for suspicion of being privy to y<sup>e</sup> murder lately done at the Town of Lackagh in y<sup>e</sup> said county (except y<sup>e</sup> two that are condemned to be hanged for y<sup>e</sup> same) together with the reputed wife of Donogh O'Derrick (also blind Donnogh) in y<sup>e</sup> custody of him y<sup>e</sup> said Marshall to y<sup>e</sup> end



hee y<sup>e</sup> said Captain Coleman may (with y<sup>e</sup> first opportunity of wind and weather) convey them with his ship and deliver them in safe custody to y<sup>e</sup> Governor of Waterford, to bee by him delivered unto Captain John Norris, merchant there, who is safely to keep the said Priests and other the prisoners abovesaid at his own charge untill he shall transport them for y<sup>e</sup> Barbadoes or other the Plantation Islands in America. And y<sup>e</sup> said Marshall Peak is hereby further Ordered to bring a perfect List of y<sup>e</sup> said Priests and Prisoners with all speed to y<sup>e</sup> Clerk of y<sup>e</sup> Council, the said Captain Norris, having put in security for their safe transportation as aforesaid.

“Dublin Castle, the 29th of November, 1655.

“To Philip Peak, Esq., Marshall at y<sup>e</sup> four Courts, Dublin, or his Deputy.”

Some of these prisoners of the Fitzgerald family, who, no doubt, were sorely straightened living on the scanty allowance afforded them by the Council, asked that some of their substance should be sold, and the proceeds given to them before they were put on the transport ship. Here is the answer of the Council:—

“Upon consideration had of the petition of Margery Fitzgerald, Henry Fitzgerald, and other prisoners committed to the Marshalsey of Dublin for y<sup>e</sup> murther at Lackagh in y<sup>e</sup> County of Kildare, praying that their stock and goods then seized from them by y<sup>e</sup> Commonwealth might be restored to them, It is thought fitt and Ordered that the high Sheriff of the said County of Kildare doe forthwith take care that y<sup>e</sup> goods secured upon y<sup>e</sup> apprehension of y<sup>e</sup> late prisoners brought from Lackagh aforesaid to Dublin (and formerly belonging to any of them and ordered to be inventoried) bee appraised and sold for y<sup>e</sup> best advantage of y<sup>e</sup> Commonwealth, and cause the proceed thereof to bee distributed as followeth (vizt.) ffor the satisfaction of the Marshall for dyett and flees and for y<sup>e</sup> flees of the prisoners that were tryed and acquitted by sentence of Court and due to the respective Officers there, in all amounting to y<sup>e</sup> sum of eight pounds; And that then fitting reparation (such as y<sup>e</sup> Council shall award) bee thereout made and given unto y<sup>e</sup> widows of y<sup>e</sup> two murthered persons at Lackagh, and y<sup>e</sup> remainder to be sent to y<sup>e</sup> persons that are sent to be shipt from Passage or Waterford, and transported to y<sup>e</sup> Barbadoes to bee distributed amongst them according to right.”

The next Order, issued five days later, gives the names of those thenceforth deported:—

“Ordered that Philip Peak, Marshall of the ffour Courts at Dublin doe forthwith upon Receipt hereof deliver or cause to be

delivered all and every the undernamed persons unto Captain Robert Coleman, Commander of the Wexford frigate, who is with the first opportunity of wind and weather ordered to convey them with his ship and deliver them in safe custody to the Governor of Waterford, to be forthwith delivered unto Captain John Norris, Merchant there, who is to receive and keep the said Prisoners above named and to be maintained at the charge of him the said Captain Norris from the time of their Landing at Waterford or Passage untill hee shall transport them for the Barbadoes or other English Plantation Islands in America. And for delivery of the said prisoners as aforesaid this shall be unto the said Marshall Peake a sufficient discharge.

“Dublin Castle the 4th of December, 1645 (*recte* 1654).

“To Marshall Philip Peak or his Deputy.”

The names of the prisoners to be delivered as above directed are as followeth, viz. :—

James Tuite, priest	Bryan Ruddery	Philip O'Connollan
Robert Kegan, priest	James Brennan	Morgan fforran
Redmund Moore	John Carron	Wm. Moloy
John Poby, priest	Donnogh Kelly	Morrice Hennegat
“ Henry ffzgarrett		Honora Doolin
Morrice ffzgarrett		Dorothy ffarrall
Margery ffzgarret		Ellinor ffzgarret
Mary Grafton, wife to		Honora McConlon
Henry ffzgarret		Kath. Heylan
Bridgett ffzgarrett,		Ann Keating
daughter to Loughlin Kely		Eliza Keating
Connor Toole		Margery Crenyan
Margt. King		Kathleen Weighlan
Margt. Rely		Owney Hooke
Margt. Donegan		Eliz. Morran
Kath. Brennan		Honora McGibbery
Giles Crevy		Daniel O'Rourk”
Margt. Doolin		

I must reserve to the next issue the passages from contemporary authors and further extracts from the Council Books on this subject.

D. MURPHY, S.J.

## THE IRISH DRINK DISEASE.

## SOME CAUSES, AND A CURE.

IT is neither wise nor patriotic to gloss over the fact that amongst sections of the Irish population the craving for intoxicating drink has become a disease. If the present state of things should continue for any length of time, something little short of national ruin must be the inevitable result. Morally and intellectually the nation will run to waste. It is a question, we might almost say a crisis, demanding anxious thought, and earnest remedies. It is a question which no one section of the people standing alone will be able to settle. At the moment Irish circumstances are in a peculiar state. There are hundreds in the land who are hopeful of a new Ireland, developing her immense resources, bringing new energies into her social and her national life, and realizing those many native ideals and aspirations, which in the tension, clash, and poverty of the previous decades were seen but dimly, or seen not at all. It is a time when the social reformer, and the man who plans industrial and material developments has the hope that his schemes at long last will have field and scope. More than that, there is a growing section in the nation, and in the Irelands abroad who have foregathered for intellectual propagandism and a literary revival, who realize that the inner life, the spiritual wants and wishes of the nation have not yet found meet expression; and that a zealous effort should be made to prepare the way, at least, for an epoch of intellectual satisfaction, when the mind-hunger of the thinking Irish classes will not be pitiful and hopeless, as in the main it is in our day. Now all this is noble and worthy work, deserving the most eager support from a nation that means to live, and not stagnate in the world. But to carry it on, even half way, to perfection, to make it even moderately successful, will necessitate general earnestness, abiding zeal, not ephemeral propagandism, and will be all but impossible while large masses of the people continue sunk in the depths to which intoxicants have brought them. It is great work, but it will require great

labour, great patience, and perhaps great sacrifices. Our cultured idealists who think of art, and song, and literature, will understand that, after all, to do their fullest work they must have the people with them; and it were but a sorry state of things, withal, though one part of the nation were a Western Christian Greece, if the other were lost in the moral morass of intemperance and materialism.

It is no exaggeration to say that of this moral morass there is very grave danger indeed. Some time ago at a great meeting in Dublin, His Grace, Archbishop Walsh gave a series of startling facts and figures illustrative of the progress and havoc of the drink disease in Ireland. His Grace dealt at length with the question as it affected Dublin; but those who are acquainted with life in many parts of the country, are quite prepared to say that therein the ruin is fully as deep, and the remedy fully as needful, as in the metropolis itself. Of late years the Archbishop has done noble work on behalf of temperance, in the capital and elsewhere; and it is a hopeful augury that this work continues to be rewarded with success. There are many who should have rallied to the Archbishop's side ere this, but have not dreamed of doing so. The fact is, that since Father Mathew's time we have had nothing like a real temperance movement in the country. We have had worthy but isolated workers, and an intolerable amount of indifference and apathy, with a surprising sum of ignorance as regards the nature and extent of the ravages that were being wrought.

No doubt a general temperance movement would achieve a vast amount of good. But we have to look at the matter in another light. A temperance movement mainly affects one generation; and when its day is done, and the enthusiasm subsided, the cause of the evil is probably as vital as ever. And temperance agitators are not easy to initiate generation after generation. Father Mathew did wonders for us; but we are now in as sorry a state as when he took his great work in hand; and the prospect of a crusade such as he inaugurated and led to success is doubtful, to say the least.

Possibly, however, we shall find that such a crusade is by



no means necessary. And even were it possible in all the old enthusiasm and fervour, it would not achieve all that is needed. It would not reach all the classes affected by the drink evil; and, furthermore, there is little chance that it would be permanent in its results. The fact is—and this is too often lost sight of—that temperance organizations alone, with temperance speeches, and temperance papers, however far they go, will not make Ireland a sober nation. It is necessary that yet other means should be called into service.

We have, from time to time, fearful pictures of the horrors wrought by drink, and the truth and the startling nature of those pictures few will be found to deny. But are such horrors traceable solely to the mere animal love of drink for its own sake? Are they all even traceable to the fact that the Irishman is, *par excellence*, a social being, loving the flowing bowl for the thrilling animation and the temporary exaltation of the spirit it brings? This latter fact has certainly a great deal to do with the matter; but, to leave the question here would not be half stating the case. There is one great cause of Irish intoxication, a full realization of which will suggest a great cure. It is to be found in the dreariness, the utter hopelessness, the dull, heart-killing bleakness that for many years have characterized so much of Irish local life. The villages and the parishes have grown more desolate with the decades. Old neighbours have gone to the four winds; many of the young people, as soon as they come to years of vigour, or even before it, fly from their native valleys as from a land of plagues and wrath. Ruins, sad memories, and shadows are left as neighbours to the remainder. Life grows less and less stirring, poverty become more pressing, the old sports and pastimes are, in the main, forgotten, the fireside circles are less eager and cheerful; even the old lore and legends that delighted the folk of earlier generations are slowly dying out from the hills, the old homes, and the bye-ways. There is little or nothing to stir the heart, or appeal to the fancy of a loving, generous, and imaginative people. It is all hard and constant work for the body, and little better than stagnation for the mind. That the people should have variety and brightness in their

lives, seems to be the last thing thought of—if thought of at all—in many circles. The concerts, outings, and entertainments that are frequent features in even the poorest missions throughout Britain, are practically unknown in too many districts of Ireland. Is it so utterly surprising, after all, that, left to dull days, sickly life, and stagnation, the intoxicant should be sought to give some poor and delusive life to the existence of great numbers of the peasantry?

Let us go further into this question, for it has other lessons. What is done for the mind-life of the young men and women in the country districts—aye, even in the towns—of Ireland? After their half education in the National schools (if even so much is vouchsafed them), what have they to occupy, or to brighten, or to elevate their intellects? They have not books, lectures, technical schools, reading-rooms, even literary newspapers, within their reach. In addition to dull-going life, they are in the midst of intellectual barrenness. It is strange to think how much fruitful work could be done in this direction, with a little effort and sacrifice, by those who have some understanding of the matter; but it is pitiable to think how generally it is all neglected. The truth is, throughout Ireland we are ignoring splendid levers, and letting noble energies go to wreck or waste: and then, when too late, we express our astonishment at the fact that the people, in the midst of dreariness and a moping existence, are not temperate, happy, energetic, cultured, and all else that is excellent. Surely young men's societies, simple libraries, good lectures, interesting entertainments, and kindred items, could easily be organized in hundreds of places where now they are unknown. The results would be inspiring. No cause would have more to gain from this than the cause of temperance. Open this brightness before the minds of the people, give them this intellectual food, in however small measure, keep lofty ideas and examples before them, especially at those ages when they are most plastic and impressionable, and the very best means are thus taken to guard them, not only from intemperance, but all other slavish and materialistic habits. Furthermore, such pursuits, keeping their minds upon high

tracks, would lead to achievements that we can only dream of to-day ; and undoubtedly the nobler public opinion thus gradually created would be of paramount importance to many besides the temperance worker and the social reformer. To those who know the Irish peasantry, with all the elements of good that are within it, its innate love for learning, art, and imagination, there is nothing that will seem overdrawn or impossible in what is here sketched out. The great want nowadays throughout Irish life is more national education—in the true sense. With that we could win a great deal. Books are not yet within the reach of the people, and it is trying to think how little the present Irish booksellers are doing, and seem inclined to do, to remedy the present evil. The local press, too, is sadly wanting in its duty as far as national teaching is concerned ; but the reason, perhaps, is not far to seek. It is sad to say that even the pulpit is not nearly as Irish as it might be. To thousands of the people the records of Ireland's missionaries, and the lore and lessons of Irish ecclesiastical history, are things that are entirely unknown. One more grievance, and we may leave the list for the present. In a country circumstanced like Ireland, one would think that books of agricultural and industrial import would be common in the homes of the farmers, at least ; but they are not. The result is, our farmers are left far behind in the way of competition : one more reason why their hearts grow hopeless, their lives uninteresting, and the temptations of the " drink fiend " and other fiends are listened to all the more readily.

The moral of it all is that the lives of the people must be made brighter ; that worthy aims and inspiring ideals must be kept before them : that congenial books and the higher national education must be placed within their reach. Temperance then will come where it is now unknown, and bring many other virtues in its train. There is a movement on foot for the revival of an Irish popular literature, the creation of a brighter and more thoughtful public opinion, the awakening of native aims and ideals in the homes and hearts of the masses. It deserves the most zealous support of every Irishman and every Irishwoman.

D. O'BRIEN.

## XIMENES, AND THE CONVERSION OF THE MOORS.

THE recent festivities in honour of the fourth centenary of Christopher Columbus, and the actual World's Fair at Chicago, have contributed largely in directing attention to the history of other days. Our thoughts are full of the past. A revival of interest has evidently taken place in the history of Spain, or, to be more accurate, in that period of its history when the news of the discovery of an El Dorado had, to employ an anachronism, flashed across the Atlantic. The times were stirring, and unique was their influence on the destinies of the world. Dreams of a most extravagant nature were indulged in, and one feels inclined to say never were dreams better founded. But other great men stand prominently on the canvas of the past. At this epoch the power of Ferdinand and Isabel was at its zenith. At their court a galaxy of genius and talent was to be seen. Those were the days of the famous Cardinal Mendoza, of the renowned Captain Gonzalvo de Cordova, of the great Franciscan Ximenez de Cisneros: and, as the title of the paper indicates, it is with the last of these honoured names we are concerned. It is not our intention to consider his life in its entirety: that were too gigantic an undertaking. Besides, that striking life has attracted the attention of men thoroughly equipped for its treatment. It has often been the theme of gifted writers. But to be just in our appreciation of those who have written his biography, the latest, that of Héfele (an admirable translation of which we owe to the pen of Canon Dalton) ranks first. Nevertheless, if we are to believe Philarète Chasles:—

“ Il y a un Ximénez qui attend son Tacite et il ne le trouvera pas probablement. La gloire de Ximénez est dans la lutte partielle mais effective contre l'atmosphère qui l'environnait et cette lutte protège, honore, immortalisera sa mémoire. Il a porté la hache dans les vieux abus des convents, opposé une digue aux oppressions des Espagnols vainqueurs dans l'Amérique du sud, créé des greniers d'abondance, favorisé les lettres, propagé la science de



l'agriculture, ouvert des asiles aux femmes et aux filles pauvres, protégé la presse naissante, contribué à la réforme du Calendrier Julien, enfin employé l'imprimerie à la propagation de la Bible."

His is a life which has extorted the unwilling admiration of the most bigotted.

But in that beneficent career there is one episode which has bristled with difficulties for the historical student—a problem which baffles all his ingenuity to solve with satisfaction to himself. It is a chapter in his life which seems quite out of harmony with the rest; and this, to say the least, is disappointing to those who, like the writer, own to the soft impeachment of being hero-worshippers. By some it is passed over in rather significant silence, or a very feeble defence is set up, or again it falls under the lash of those critics who are hostile to his memory. What we refer to has inspired us to write this article, and it is the extraordinary attitude of Ximenes in regard to the conversion of the Moors of Grenada. It is urged by many that this part of his life admits of no defence whatsoever; that it was a mistake; that the sooner this is recognised the better; no man is perfect, &c.; at best it is a rather discreditable proceeding. They regret that it should be the one blot on an otherwise fair and spotless escutcheon.

We would venture to demur in assenting to this summary dismissal of the subject, and in support of our contention to put forward a theory which, if not the real answer to the objections raised, affords a plausible way out of the difficulty. We contend, therefore, that in this much-disputed incident, Ximenes was actuated with the highest motives, and influenced not by the impulse of the moment, but by sound principles, and therefore thoroughly consistent, and as a consequence worthy of praise.

The point at issue is not unfrequently stated in the following terms:—Eight years after the conquest of Granada, *i. e.* 1499, Ximenes was summoned to lend his powerful aid to the first Archbishop of that city, the gentle Talavera, in bringing the Moors to the one fold of the Catholic Church. The measures hitherto adopted to secure this object were too pusillanimous for the bold energetic mind of Ximenes.

He discarded these dilatory means; he introduced brutal force and precipitated a crisis. In utter defiance of a treaty by which full liberty of conscience was assured to the vanquished, in total disregard of their legitimate rights, he compelled them either to embrace Christianity or to be imprisoned or exiled. With that righteous indignation begotten of our nineteenth century broad views, some ask what excuse is forthcoming to justify such a gross violation of individual liberty? The overbearing arrogant nature of Ximenes is to blame, his religious enthusiasm outstepped the limits of his authority, great as that authority was; and, as King Ferdinand declared, this imprudent zeal of Ximenes all but cost Spain the fruits of many years of war, &c.

So much for the prejudiced statement of the case. But what are the facts? It is true that Ximenes received the command of the Catholic sovereigns to co-operate with Talavera in the conversion of the Moors. It is also true that he put new life into the crusade, as we may well call it. His method has a certain flavour of novelty, but he kept well within the bounds of the treaty. Thus, he invited the chief Alfaquis and Fakih of the Moors to the palace, where frequent conferences on religion were held. At the same time he strove by the rich presents he bestowed on them to confirm the favourable impression produced by his words; and, having regard to the times, who will blame him? His efforts were soon rewarded: several of them were won over to the true faith, and this example was followed by many others; so that Ximenes had the good fortune to baptize by aspersion, as many as four thousand in one day.<sup>1</sup> Granada, the glory of the Saracens, underwent a transformation. On all sides emblems of Christianity were visible; bells, the sound of which is so hateful to Moslem ears, were heard ringing out their joyous peal, and, as Gomez de Castro remarks, Ximenes, who was looked upon as the efficient cause of this change, was greeted with the surname of *Alfaqui campanero*.

<sup>1</sup> This, and the following description, is mainly taken from Héfele's *Life of Ximenes*.

This defection from Islamism—this great betrayal, as it might be called—naturally created a profound impression and produced a strong reaction among those who remained true to the religion of Mahomet. Could they look on with indifference while this work of ruin, as it seemed to them, was going forward? Not they. Could they not succeed in checking this exodus? They sought to do so by fair means and foul. They sowed the seeds of hatred against the Christian name; they stirred up the masses against the government. Ximenes heard of this danger to the peace of the kingdom, and acting with that energy which was ever a distinguishing feature in his character, he ordered the chief conspirators to be thrown into prison; and there, according to some writers, they were forced in spite of their protests and resistance to listen to instruction in the Christian faith. Now it is admitted that if this charge could be substantiated it would be most damaging to the reputation of Ximenes, as it constituted a flagrant violation of the treaty already referred to. But it is emphatically denied by Llorente,<sup>1</sup> who proves that the chaplains acted on their own initiative and without the authority of Ximenes, either express or tacit.

The moment was, undoubtedly, a critical one, and the rebellion which had been smouldering for some time burst forth in the following circumstances. Among the Moors there was a certain class called the Elchi, or Elches; *i.e.*, those born of renegade parents. Now it was held that these did not share in the religious clauses of the treaty; that therefore their children could be seized and brought up as Catholics despite the protests of their parents. One day Salzedo, the steward of Ximenes, accompanied by an alguazil and a young retainer of the Archbishop's household, penetrated into the Albaycin,<sup>2</sup> or Moorish quarters, in order to bring away the daughter of one of these Elchis. The girl, however, refused to go with them. Her screams, her violent resistance, attracted a crowd of idlers. They took in the situation at once. The purport of the presence of

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de l'Inquisition*, t. i., page 335.

<sup>2</sup> Also Albaicin.

these strangers was passed from mouth to mouth ; their manner soon grew threatening, and in the excitement which followed, the alguazil, who had rendered himself especially odious, was killed with a stone. The taking of this officer's life may have been accidental ; but, far from restraining them, it increased their fury. The entire Albaycin rose as one man, their ranks were swollen by the accession of malcontents from other parts of the city, and, waxing more desperate as time went on, they hurried to the Archiepiscopal Palace, bent on ridding themselves of the chief cause of their grievances.

We pass over the courage displayed by Ximenes in this emergency ; the measures adapted to quell the rebellion ; the effect it produced in the Court, then at Seville. These, besides being well-known historical facts, are beside the question for the time being. What we would call attention to, is that by this rebellion the Moors forfeited every vestige of privilege, as far as the first treaty was concerned ; and at once it will be seen how unjustly the subsequent action of Ximenes is challenged, as being in opposition thereto. He seized his opportunity ; he struck the iron whilst it was hot ; and, with the consent of his sovereigns, he offered to them full pardon if they embraced Christianity, or the alternative of undergoing the penalty of high treason if they refused. This has called forth the condemnatory remark of Prescott, as being a masterpiece of monkish casuistry, for he attributes to Ximenes the foreknowledge of this rebellion, which his coercive legislation was designed to bring to a head. There is nothing, however, to prove this assertion.

But is not the admission on our part tantamount to a concession of the whole case against Ximenes ; and, besides, how are we to explain this change of front in him ? How are we to reconcile this aggressive action with that incident in his early life, when, returning from Rome, armed with letters called *expectativæ*, he showed himself such a sturdy champion of his own rights : and rather than abate one jot of his just demands, he preferred to undergo a long and painful imprisonment, at the instance of Archbishop Carillo ?



How could he have so strangely altered his opinions as to invade the most sacred rights of man, the very sanctuary of the human conscience, and enforce obedience to a religion which, from the very nature of the case, many must have detested in their hearts? As this objection is intimately linked with the one which comes now under our notice, we reserve the one answer for both.

It is objected that Ximenes went against the spirit of the Church, in bringing pressure to bear where conviction alone is admissible. We are asked, does not such action run counter to the whole scope of our religion? Is not such violence reprobated by St. Thomas, 3 p. qu. 68, art. 10? We answer this with a distinction. That it is against the opinion of the Angelic Doctor, is true; but the Church has tolerated another opinion, the opinion of the school in which Ximenes studied. It will come, perhaps, as a surprise to many, that Scotus, who, as l'abbé Bourquard<sup>1</sup> has it:—“*établit ses raisonnements sur la certitude philosophique et la, liberté morale,*” should have held a view seemingly contrary to liberty; but that he has done so, and why he has done so, may be gathered from his works, lib. 4, disp. 4, quæes. 9.

Montefortino, moreover, a commentator of Scotus, who is justly praised as giving the true mind of Scotus, and who has reduced the doctrine of the Subtle Doctor to a *Summa* like to that of St. Thomas in form, but who declares in his preface, “*frequenter sensa magis quam verba damus,*” gives the opinion of Scotus in the following question:—

“*Utrum pueri Hebræorum vel aliorum infidelium sint, invitis parentibus, baptizandi? Respondeo dicendum, bene facturos principes si compellant Judæorum, et infidelium filios suscipere Baptisma, etiam ipsis invitis et renuentibus. Nam in parvulos illos, et quoslibet alios Deus habet majus ius, quam proprii parentes; ergo major ex parte eorum obligatio obtemperandi Deo præcipienti Baptismi susceptionem, quam obediendi parentibus nolentibus illum suscipi a filiis, siquidem in potestatibus ordinatis, potestas inferior non obligat in iis quæ sunt contra superioris potestatis mandata expresse præcipientis contrarium ejus, quod fieri mandat inferior potestas. Igitur cum parvuli per seipsos non possint Deo obtemperare in Christo renascendo per*

<sup>1</sup> *Essai sur la methode dans les sciences theologiques*, p. 143.

Baptismum debant principes qui in administranda republica Dei ministri sunt, zelare pro domino servando supremi Domini, cujus sunt Vicarii in republica gentium, et per consequens religiose et pie facere qui tales ad Baptismi susceptionem compelleret. Eo tamen in facto debere esset adhibendae cautelae. Prima ne parentes id futurum praesentientes pueros suos neci traherent praesertim a Principibus rapuerentur ad Baptismum. Deinde Principibus curandum esset, ut taliter baptizati religiose et pie educarentur, ac in fide catholica in necessariis ad salutem instruerentur.

Videtur etiam pie ac religiose facturos Principes, si ipsos Hebraeos caeterosque infideles in ipsorum regnis degentes minis et terroribus urgerent et cogerent ad Baptismum suscipiendum, non quidem minis quibus ipsis mors aut mutilatio membrorum intentaretur, sed exilia, factura temporalium bonorum edicto proposito, quò significaretur velle eos et jubere in suis regnis fidem Catholicam ab omnibus servari, ideoque recusantibus Baptismum suscipere denunciare exilium, et omnium bonorum facturam, quomodo gestum fuisse temporibus Regis Assebuti narrat Concilium IV., Tolet. cap. 56, ut habetur dist. 45, c. de Judaeis, quem proinde Concilium pium, et religiosum Principem vocat. Nam etsi ea de causa ne scilicet cogerentur solum vertere, aut fortunis omnibus expoliari, inducerentur ad Baptismi susceptionem, atque ita plerique non essent ex animo fideles, nihilominus minus malum fore, non posse juxta eorum damnatam et illicitam sectam vivere, quam posse libere servare palamque profiteri. Ad haec, quamquam ipsi non essent vere fideles, nec tales etiam futuri, filii tamen et nepotes eorum in tertia et quarta progenie evaderent vere fideles, ut alii Catholici, ob educationem ex lege Evangelica et communionem cum caeteris Christi fidelibus."<sup>1</sup>

That such extreme methods are opposed to our modern ideas of religious liberty, is not the question. We took upon ourselves to show that Ximenes had acted in conformity and not inconsistently with his principles, and that in constraining the Moors as he did he was merely giving practical proof of these principles. In fact, Peter Martyr points out the same advantage to be derived by Spain being purged of the Infidels. Should anyone object that perhaps Ximenes did not know of the doctrine of Scotus, especially as Montefortino, from whom the quotations have been taken, wrote only in the beginning of the last century, we would refer him to the

<sup>1</sup> *Ter. par. Summae Ioannis Duns Scoti, quaest lxxviii., art. 10, Montefortino.*

constitutions of the Order of Friars Minor, and to the *Life of Scotus* by Wadding, who says, cap. 15:—

“Ad tres nobilissimas in Hispania accessi Universitates Coninbricensem, Salmanticensem Complutensem, in unaquaque harum vidi instituta subsellia et destinatos Magistros pro Scoti disciplina tradenda. . . . In Complutensi (that of Alcala, famous for the first polyglot Bible, and founded, as all the world knows, by Ximenes), omnium primariam (sedem) Scotus obtinuit.”

Our task is done. Insignificant as it is, it has been a labour of love for us, for we have long desired to meet the objections raised against the memory of Ximenes. We think, therefore, that we have sufficiently vindicated his action on this occasion. The atmosphere had to be cleared in order that the sun of truth might shine forth. Spain, which had derived such advantages from his vigilant care and holy life, desired to see him raised to the altars of the Church. Philip IV., in 1650 and 1655, endeavoured to obtain the introduction of the process of his beatification. But little progress has been made of late years in this direction. Although Rome has not yet spoken, Ximenes is honoured as a saint in his fatherland, his name is to be found in seven Spanish martyrologies, and let us hope that the day is not far distant when we may venerate him publicly as one of those reigning with Christ.

In conclusion, we put before our readers the beautiful epitaph of Vergara, which is inscribed on his tomb at Alcala:—

“Condideram musis Franciscus grande Lyceum,  
 Condor in exiguo nunc ego sarcophago.  
 Praetextum junxi sacco, galeamque galero  
 Frater, Dux, Praesul, cardineusque Pater.  
 Quin virtute mea junctum est diadema cucullo  
 Cum mihi regnanti paruit Hisperia.”

F. ANDREW, O.S.F.

## SEN-PATRICK.

THE Abbey of Glastonbury was situated in the south-west of Great Britain, on an island surrounded by rich meadows and fair orchards, and it was therefore called "the Island of Apples" (Avalonia) by the Romans; "the Glassy Island" (Iniswytrin); and "the Happy Island," by the British inhabitants of the country.

" Insula pomorum quæ fortunata vocatur,  
Ex re nomen habet quia per se singula profert  
Non opus est ille sulcantibus arva colonis,  
Omnis abest cultus nisi quem natura ministrat,  
Utro foecundas segetes producit et herbas,  
Nataque poma suis prætonso germine sylvis."<sup>1</sup>

Few places in Britain won greater renown than the island monastery of Glastonbury; it was another Rome to the people; the scene, according to popular tradition of the labours and death of St. Joseph of Arimathea, and the home of the first followers of the Christian faith in the island. Every stone of the sacred building had its history and its legend, and carried back the mind to the establishment of the Christian religion in Britain, and patriotism and piety combined to show honour to it, for King Arthur and Queen Guinevere were believed to repose in the tomb before the altar, and pilgrims thronged there to pray before the shrine of St. Joseph, and to venerate the relics of St. Patrick and St. Gildas.<sup>2</sup>

The monastery of Glastonbury, inhabited partly by Irish monks, and partly by British monks, was already famous when the Anglo-Saxons still worshipped Wodin. Long before the time when St. Augustine landed upon the shore of Kent it had become the centre of religious teaching in southern Britain; and the fame of its founder, the holy Abbot Patrick, had spread far and wide throughout the island. Alas for Glastonbury now! Her choirs are silent; the Virgin of England lies in the dust; her holy places are defiled; ivy

<sup>1</sup> Camden's *Britannia*, page 77.

<sup>2</sup> *Dublin Review*, July, 1857.



hangs on the ruined walls; the stars gleam sadly through the broken arches upon the tombs of forgotten saints, and the owl and the night-crow keep their watches amid the forsaken aisles, where for fifteen hundred years unceasing prayer went up for the welfare of England.<sup>1</sup>

William of Malmesbury, born in Somersetshire at the beginning of the twelfth century, and remarkable alike for his learning and his historical researches, proclaims in his *Life of St. Dunstan* the glories of that ancient church; and in his book on the *Antiquities of Glastonbury*, he gives a list of the first Abbots of that renowned sanctuary, beginning with St. Patrick, its founder and first abbot:—Patrick Benignus, Worgret, Lademund, Bregorde, &c.<sup>2</sup> William of Malmesbury also severely criticises Osbern, a biographer of St. Dunstan, for his errors with regard to the origin of that ancient British monastery. “How much he wanders from the truth, is shown by the names of your abbots, who were at Glastonbury for four hundred and fifty-three years before the birth of Dunstan from the death of the Blessed Patrick, in the year 472, until Dunstan saw the light in the year 925.”<sup>3</sup>

William of Malmesbury, John of Glastonbury, Vossius, and Marianus Victorius, Bishop of Reatino, published an ancient document, which recounts the founding of the monastery of Glastonbury by St. Patrick. Marianus, when he was in England, copied it from a very old manuscript which he found in the monastic library there.<sup>4</sup> It is as follows:—

“In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, I, Patrick, the humble servant of God, was sent by the holy Pope Celestine to Ireland, in the year of the Incarnation 425, and I converted the Irish to the way of truth. And when I had strengthened them in the Catholic faith, I at length came back to Britain; and having been guided, as I believe, by God, ‘who is the life and the way,’ I came to the island of Iniswytrin, where I found an ancient holy

<sup>1</sup> James A. Froude, *Life of St. Neot*.

<sup>2</sup> This name appears on an ancient stone pyramid near the Church of Glastonbury.— Camden's *Britannia*, page 81.

<sup>3</sup> *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls series), page 251.

<sup>4</sup> *Patrologia Latina* (Migne), vol. liii., page 793.

place, chosen and blessed by God in honour of the inviolate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. And I found there some brethren imbued with the rudiments of the Catholic faith and of holy life, who had taken the place of the disciples of St. Fagan and St. Diruvian, whose names, as I truly believe, are written in heaven on account of the merits of their life (Phil. iv. 3), and as the just shall be in everlasting remembrance (Ps. xi. 7), and as I tenderly loved these same brethren, I wish to mention their names in my writing. They are:—Brumban, Hyregdan, Brenwal, Wenereth, Bantomneweng, Adelwolred, Loyor, Wellias, Breden, Swelwes, Hinloern, and another Hyn.<sup>1</sup> These being of high birth, desiring to adorn their nobility by the works of faith, chose to lead a solitary life; and as I found them humble and meek, I chose rather to be lowly with them than to dwell in royal abodes (Ps. lxxxiii.). But as we were all of ‘one heart and one mind’ (Acts iv. 32), we resolved to dwell together, to fare alike, and to sleep in the same abode. And so they put me over them against my will, ‘for I was not worthy to loose the latchet of their shoes’ (Mark i. 7).

“And whilst we were thus leading a monastic life, according to the rules of the writings of St. Fagan and St. Diruvian, where it was stated that twelve disciples of St. Philip and St. James had built that ancient church in honour of our Advocate, through the instruction of the blessed Archangel Gabriel; and that, moreover, the Lord had from heaven dedicated that same church in honour of His Mother, and that three Pagan kings had bestowed on these twelve men twelve plots of land for their support. And I have found also, in more modern writings, that St. Fagan and St. Diruvian had besought thirty years indulgence from Pope Elutherius, who had sent them there.<sup>2</sup> And I, Brother Patrick, have obtained in my time twelve years from Pope Celestine of holy memory.

“A long time afterwards, taking with me my fellow-monk, Wellias, we made our way, with great labour, through a thick wood to the summit of a hill, which rises aloft in that same island,<sup>3</sup> and when we had reached the top we beheld an old and half-ruined oratory, still suitable, however, for Christian worship; and, as it seemed to me, chosen by God. And when we had entered into it, we were refreshed with such a sweet fragrance,

<sup>1</sup> Some of these names appear on a lofty stone pyramid, which was already crumbling through age in the time of William of Malmesbury.—*Vide Camden’s Britannia*, page 81.

<sup>2</sup> Elutherius became Pope in the year 177. The custom of granting indulgences dates from the early ages of the Church.—Bellarmine, *De Indul.* l. i., c. 3; the *Catholic Dictionary*, art. “Indulgence.”

<sup>3</sup> Tor-hill, where many centuries later, the last abbot of Glastonbury was unjustly hanged by the order of the licentious apostate Henry VIII.

that we thought that we were in paradise. Going in and out, and carefully examining the spot, we found an almost obliterated volume, wherein were written the Acts of the Apostles, and also the Acts and the Life of the aforesaid St. Fagan and St. Diruvian. But we discovered at the end of this book a writing, which made known that the aforesaid St. Fagan and St. Diruvian had built an oratory there, by the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in honour of the Archangel St. Michael, in order that he might be honoured there by men, who might, by the will of God, lead men to everlasting honours. And, as that writing gave us pleasure, we strove to read to the end. That writing then declared that the venerable Fagan and Deruvian had dwelt there during nine years, and that they had besought thirty years' indulgence for all Christians who should piously visit that place in honour of St. Michael.<sup>1</sup> I and Brother Wellias, having thus found so great a treasure of the Divine goodness, fasted, prayed, and kept vigils for three months, and overcame both demons and wild beasts that often appeared to us. And one night, whilst I slept, the Lord Jesus showed Himself to me, in vision, saying: 'My servant, Patrick, know that I have chosen this place in honour of My name, and that the aid of My Archangel Michael may be invoked here. And this shall be a sign to thee and to thy brethren, that they may believe: thy left arm shall wither until thou shalt have made known what thou hast seen to thy brethren dwelling in the monastery beneath, and shalt have returned hither.' And so it happened.

"We then placed two of the brethren there, unless future shepherds should, for good reasons, decide otherwise. And I have left this present page with the Irish brethren Arnulph and Ogmar, who had come with me from Ireland, on account of their having begun to dwell, at my request, at the aforesaid lonely oratory; but I have kept a copy of it in the chest (*arca*) of Holy Mary, as a monument for posterity.

"And I, Patrick, with the advice of my brethren, grant a hundred days of indulgence to all who, with good intention, fell, with axe and hatchet, the wood on every side of the aforesaid hill, in order that an easy pathway may be opened for the Christians who come on pious pilgrimage to the Church of the ever Blessed Virgin."

This dramatic narrative, copied from the very ancient document of the Church of Glastonbury, if not authentic, is probably founded on fact.

<sup>1</sup> A chapel was dedicated to St. Michael, at Monte Gargano, in the time of Pope Gelasius I. (A.D. 492): *vide* Breviary, May 8th. Pope Boniface soon afterwards dedicated a church in his honour at Rome.

This Abbot Patrick, who founded the famous Abbey of Glastonbury, was no other than Sen-Patrick, the first preacher of the Gospel in Ireland—"The battle-chief and beloved teacher of our sage"<sup>1</sup>—i.e. of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland. Ussuard commemorates Sen-Patrick in his *Martyrology*, on August 24th, with these words:—"Nivernis Patricii Abbatis;" and the *Auctarium* thus developes it:—"In Ireland, Patrick, Abbot, and Gildard, Confessor. And this Patrick is said to have been the first teacher of the Irish; but because he failed to convert them, he proceeded as a pilgrim to the Monastery of Glastonbury, whither he came, and he there ended his life, illustrious through his virtues, and his relics seem to bear witness to this to the present day."

If Sen-Patrick thus preached the Gospel in Ireland, the meaning of the words of St. Prosper becomes plain, when he states that "Palladius was ordained by Pope Celestine, for the Scots believing in Christ, and is sent to them as their first bishop." (A.D. 431.)

The holy Abbot was unable to perfect his work in Ireland, since he was not a bishop; and he, doubtless, made known to the Apostolic See that many of the inhabitants of that far-off island had been converted, and had been baptized by him. Palladius was then sent as bishop by Pope St. Celestine, to gather in this harvest of souls; but he failed and lost heart; and whilst he was returning to Rome he died in the country of the Britons; for, as Muirchin, the biographer of St. Patrick, writes:—"No one can receive anything of earth unless it be given to him from heaven: and neither did these wild and cruel barbarians accept his teaching; nor did he wish to stay in a foreign land, and, therefore, he returned to him who sent him. But on his way back thither, having crossed the first sea, and having begun his journey by land, he died in the country of the Britons."<sup>2</sup>

Then came the great St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, a Celt like themselves, and knowing their language and their

<sup>1</sup> *Féil' of Saint Aenghus*, Aug. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Documenta de S. Patricio*. Rev. E. Hogan, S.J. Palladius probably died at Wigtown, in Scotland. *Vol. I. E. Record* (1889), page 121.



customs, and having preached the Gospel for thirty years throughout the whole island, he gathered almost all that noble race into the fold of Christ before his death.

“ From realm to realm had Patrick trod the Isle,  
And evermore God’s work beneath his hand,  
Since God had blessed that hand, ran out full spher’d ;  
And brighter than a new-created star  
The island race in feud of clan with clan,  
Barbaric, gracious else, and high of heart,  
Nor worshippers of self nor dulled through sense,  
Beholding not alone his wondrous works,  
But wondrous more the sweetness of his strength :  
And how he never shrank from flood and fire,  
And how he couched him on the wintry rocks,  
And how he sang great hymns to one who heard,  
And how he cared for poor men and the sick,  
And for the souls invisible of men,  
To him made way.” <sup>1</sup>

Sen-Patrick was the teacher of the Apostle of Ireland, and he may have been the friend of his youth, of whom he speaks so touchingly in his *Confession* :—“ My friend of friends, to whom I did confide my very soul.” St. Aenghus writes thus in his *Festology* :—

“ With the relation of the host of Srenath (Glastonbury),  
Whose history is made illustrious,  
Sen-Patrick, a battle-chief,  
The amiable preceptor of our patron.”

They loved each other during life, like David and Jonathan, and in death they were not separated. “ Amabiles et decori in vita sua, in morte quoque non sunt divisi.” Fiac, in his *Metrical Life of St. Patrick*, writes :—

“ When Patrick departed, he went to visit the other Patrick :  
Together they ascended to Jesus, the Son of Mary.”

On the north bank of the river Loire, near Tours, in France, a blackthorn tree buds and blossoms each year, when the ground is white with snow at Christmas, and its dainty flowers are called by the inhabitants the “ flowers of St. Patrick,” for the apostle of Ireland is believed to have

<sup>1</sup> *Legends of St. Patrick.* By Aubrey de Vere.

once rested beneath it, and to have blessed it.<sup>1</sup> And at Glastonbury a hawthorn tree, "as trustworthy witnesses affirm,"<sup>2</sup> budded and bore flowers at Christmastide as if it were the month of May. This is a beautiful symbol of the affection between these holy men whose virtues shone brightly amid the gloom of these early ages.

An attempt has been made to prove that Sen-Patrick was the true apostle of Ireland, and that the ancient Irish writers "shut out from view the real apostle Sen-Patrick, consigning him to obscurity and to an almost historical extinction;"<sup>3</sup> but Sen-Patrick was a Welshman who adorned his native land by his learning<sup>4</sup> and his virtues; he was the teacher of the apostle of Ireland, and having preached the Gospel for a short time in Ireland, he returned to Britain, where he died, "a portion of his relics being in after times enshrined at Glastonbury, and another portion being preserved at Armagh. But while his merits are thus extolled, there is not in any one of the Irish writers the smallest trace of his being considered the apostle of our country. On the other hand, all our writers are agreed in this, that St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnus, was Ireland's apostle, and they reckon it as Sen-Patrick's greatest eulogy that he was "the tutor of our apostle."<sup>5</sup>

Patrick of Glastonbury is called Patrick Senior by Irish annalists, and by the Saxon priest who wrote the life of St. Dunstan.<sup>6</sup> Senior in the early ages of the Church meant an abbot or prefect of a monastery, but also a priest holding high rank in a diocese.<sup>7</sup> The older monks forming the council of the abbots were also called Seniors; and this is still so among the Cistercians.

<sup>1</sup> *Life of St. Patrick*, by Rev. W. Morris.

<sup>2</sup> Camden's *Britannia*, page 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Loca Patriciana*, page 474. Rev. J. Shearman.

<sup>4</sup> The treatise, *De tribus tabernaculis*, attributed to St. Patrick (*Patrologia Migne*, vol. liii.) is probably the work of the holy Abbot of Glastonbury.

<sup>5</sup> Cardinal Moran, *Dublin Review*, April, 1880. Vide Rev S. Malone, *I. E. RECORD*, 1891, page 800.

<sup>6</sup> *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls Series). In one MSS. it is *junior*: Sen is a contraction of *senior*.

<sup>7</sup> *Lexicon mediæ et infirmæ latinitatis*.

The Cassinese declarations of the Benedictine Order state that "by seniors we mean the prior of the monastery, the master of novices, the cellarer, &c."<sup>1</sup>

Sen-Patrick is called in an ancient Irish document, "Caput sapientum seniorum ejus." In the case of Sen Patrick it very probably meant the dignity of abbot, and he is doubtless thus styled in opposition to Bishop Patrick.

"The blaze of a noble sun,  
The apostle of undefiled Erin,  
Patrick, with many thousands,  
The bulwark of our people."<sup>2</sup>

Sen-Patrick, according to Cambrian tradition, was a native of Gwyer (Gower), Glamorganshire, in South Wales, where a church was afterwards built in his honour.<sup>3</sup> He died in the year 472,<sup>4</sup> and was buried in his island monastery. Soon crowds of pilgrims came from Ireland to venerate his sacred remains, and Irish monks dwelt in that holy solitude, so that it was called by the British Glastonbury of the Irish. The Saxon priest and biographer of St. Dunstan writes at the beginning of the eleventh century that "Irish pilgrims, like the rest of the faithful, venerated Glastonbury with much affection, more especially in honour of the blessed Patrick, who was said to have rested happily there in the Lord."<sup>5</sup> And Osbern, the Precentor of Canterbury, and the friend of Archbishop Lanfranc, writing one hundred years later, declares that "the Irish were wont to come in great numbers as pilgrims to Glastonbury, and that what in others was to them goodwill, habit had made a second nature." "Many illustrious men amongst them," he writes, "nobly learned in profane and sacred literature, having left Ireland, came as pilgrims to England, and chose Glastonbury as the place of their abode, inasmuch as it was secluded from the haunts of men, and possessed everything needful

<sup>1</sup> "Ut nec seniores in regendis fratribus inaniter laborent." S. Fructuosi regula, c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Felire of Aenghus*, March 17.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. J. Shearman, *Loca Patriciana*, page 419.

<sup>4</sup> *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, Rolls Series, page 251.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, page 11.

for human life ; but above all, because it was glorious through the religious veneration of Patrick, who had come thither in olden times to preach the Gospel of the kingdom of God ; and who, having shone brightly by his life, his teaching, his signs, and his miracles, is said to have rested in the Lord in that same place.”<sup>1</sup>

William of Malmesbury having given an account in his *Life of St. Dunstan*, of the pilgrimage of the father and mother of the holy youth to the sacred shrine of Glastonbury, relates how he was left there in order to learn letters, music, and mathematics from the learned native and Irish teachers who kept school there, and how he won the love of his Irish masters. “for men of this nation dwelt there in great numbers, men every way most learned and most skilful in the liberal arts, and who, the better to serve philosophy, forsaking their fatherland, had come to Glastonbury, led more especially by the affection which they bore to their Irish preacher Patrick, whose remains, according to an ancient tradition, repose there.”<sup>2</sup>

Whilst Irishmen both at home and abroad venerate and love the great apostle of their race, they ought also to show honour to his teacher and his friend, Sen Patrick, the holy abbot of Glastonbury, in imitation of their pious ancestors who came in crowds as pilgrims to his shrine.

ALBERT BARRY, C.S.S.R.

<sup>1</sup> *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, page 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, page 56.



## GLENDALOUGH IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

## II.

No. 8 District (*continued*).

THE previous paper on the above subject, in the April number of the I. E. RECORD concluded with a short description according to Strongbow's charter of the district No. 8, or the territory of the Magillamochohmogs—or, as the old folklore phrase goes—"the Dublin mountains," southwards and seawards. It must now be noted that the Bull of Alexander III. (1179) also speaks of the same district; but, curiously enough, does not do so under the same title. The Bull gives it a more special designation, and, if anything, a prettier, and perhaps a more honouring one. This designation is:—"Grangias Gaellin Cemhghin," which obviously is meant for "Grangias Cualan Cemhghin," or the Grangias of Cualan of Kevin. Here the name Kevin is in allusion to the patron saint and founder of the diocese of Glendalough. And here, too, we have the word Cualan for the second time. We had it before as part of the title of the immediately preceding district No. 7; *i.e.*, Ui Ceallach Cualan—or the Terra Umeilgille—which was conterminous to the present-day parishes of Blessington, Ballymore, and Boystown. In the present case, this designation Cualan Cemhghin was used, it would seem, not so much to distinguish our present district, No 8, from that of No. 7, as to intimate that there was another and a third portion of Cualan independent and distinct from this, and to notify as well that this third portion of Cualan belonged not to Glendalough, but to the next and neighbouring diocese, then ruled by the great St. Laurence O'Toole; viz., the diocese of Dublin, founded by the Danes two centuries or more previous to the twelfth century.

This other portion of Cualan—the Cualan of the Danish bishops, be it remembered—comprised as a distinct diocese the territories of the present-day parishes of Saggart and Newcastle, of Clondalkin and Lucan, of Palmerstown and Chapelizod, of Kilmainham and St. James's, and the

rest of the city parishes (which used then to stretch far into the suburbs), and the whole sea-coast south of the Liffey as far as Dalkey and Killiney.

In addition to the reason advanced above to account for the title—"The Granges of Cualan of Kevin," given by the Papal Bull to this our district No. 8, perhaps it is possible and permissible to suggest another, viz., a desire on the part of Rome to perpetuate the memory of the early and holy life of St. Kevin, and to promote an abiding reverence for the main features and incidents of that early and holy life, especially amongst his own kith and kin and their descendants: Up to the twelfth century, and for a short time after, it was a living tradition, known everywhere, as to the exact spot where our saint was born; and where too his people and his kindred dwelt and ruled. But, unhappily, however it has occurred, for the last four or five centuries the tradition of this holy fact has dropped completely out of existence. And the lives of the saint, even those by the best writers, refer to this matter in the vaguest of terms. They recount simply, and at the most, that Kevin was born in eastern Lagenia, or among those Leinster men who dwelt in those days on the eastern side of Leinster and close to the sea-coast; but, where precisely, they do not venture to offer a word or a hint. Another incident was the baptism of our saint. It is beyond doubt that he was baptized by a holy priest named Cronan. And the memory of this priest is preserved to this day in Kilcrony, which the charter assures us belonged to this district of the Magillamocholmogs, or our present one No. 8. It is equally beyond doubt, that at the tender age of seven years, Kevin was sent to school, and entrusted for five years to the fond and loving charge of St. Pederog, a most holy hermit (and in after years an eminent saint in Cornwall), whose hermitage of twenty years' standing in Kevin's day was at Kilpedder, near Kilcoole. And this Kilcoole, we have also seen by the charter, was one of the churches which likewise belonged to this district, No. 8, under the name of Deirgni. Moreover, when St. Kevin finished his schooling of five years under St. Pederog, we are told that his holy parents consented to his entering at the age of twelve,

the then famous monastery of Kilnamanagh near Templeogue. This Kilnamanagh, the predecessor of St. Melruai's of Tallaght, was the nursery of many great and saintly men. And here St. Kevin spent many years of his life, growing in virtue and advancing to the highest heights of perfection under the guidance and training of Owen, Lonan, and Enna, three men most famous for holiness in these early days. The first was uncle to Kevin himself, and afterwards became first bishop of Ardstraw, in Tyrone, and one of the first founders of the diocese of Derry. The second became the patron of Templeogue; and the third also became a founder of the famous monasteries on the Isles of Arran away on the waters of the Atlantic Ocean. It was in the near neighbourhood of this Kilnamanagh, amid the woods and on the slopes of Glenismole, that our holy monk Kevin experienced and withstood victoriously the celebrated temptation, which "the poet of all circles," with a shameless perversion of the truth, has made to end so tragically in the waters of one of the two lakes at Glendalough. It was in this Glenismole, too, that Kevin acquired his characteristic love and tenderness for the birds of song. This Glenismole has been so called by the Irish because of its being the glen of the thrushes. Both Kilnamanagh and Glenismole are near Templeogue; and we learn from the charter that Templeogue is one of the churches within the territory of the Magillamocholmogs. This coulan, then of the Magillamocholmogs became distinguished and ennobled in the course of ages, because these main incidents in Kevin's life, his birth, his christening, his schooling, and his first training as a monk, took place at various spots within its bounds. And Rome, by the twelfth century, coming to know of these incidents as historic facts, determined in the Bull of Alexander III. (1179), to commemorate the memory of them by fittingly characterising the district as the "Granges of Cualan of Kevin."

It must be borne in mind, however, that it is not sought now to insinuate that St. Kevin (though of royal blood himself), was actually a Magillamocholmog, or one of the Ui Donehada, or one of the Ui Cealleach, or even one of the O'Tooles or the O'Byrnes. These clans, as clans or septs,

had no existence in the days of St. Kevin; neither did they come into being for more than a century after the death of St. Kevin, which took place A.D. 618.

To return from this unavoidable, but, it is to be hoped, not uninteresting digression—the granges of the Cualan of Kevin, as named and noticed in the Papal Bull, amount to the number of ten—just one more than the number of the churches and towns mentioned in the charter, viz., nine. And the names of these granges are, with one or two exceptions, wholly different. At first sight these two points as to the number and names seem to create a serious discrepancy between both documents. But in reality, and on closer examination, we will come to see that there is no discrepancy whatever between them. The ten granges given in the Bull comprise exactly the same territory as do the nine churches detailed in the charter. To make this evident, and at once perceptible, it will be necessary to put the two lists of names side by side :—

ALEXANDER'S BULL.	STRONGBOW'S CHARTER.	
1. Athicip	1. Teachdologa	(Templeogue & Rath-farnham)
2. Ballinvodrach	2. Ballivodram	(Sandyford and Glencullen)
3. Cellopscupedam	3. Cellescoibscilleam	(Kill-'o-the-Grange & Tullystown)
4. Senekil, Ballyifind	4. Glenmuneri	(Shankil and Old Connaught)
5. Erman	5. Celladgair	(Killegar and Ennis-kerry)
6. Cellgnoc	6. Cell mo mothenoc	(Kilmacanogue and Kileroney)
7. Thehugonuaill	7. Villa Udenetha	(Bray, Old Rathdown & Templecarrig)
8. Desert Cellaig	8. Deirgui	(Delgany & Kilcoole)
9. (Acad eluan) male-chain	9. (Cell Maccu Bin-riun)	(Hills & Lowlands of Newcastle)

We shall now go through each of these granges in succession. And the following remarks are offered to help to clear away the seeming discrepancies in the two lists :—

### 1. *Athicip, Techdologa.*

This word Athicip is a corruption and a mutilation of



the old time name of the territory called Taney. It is a matter of history that there were two Taney's, one beside the other, and each respectively called, the first half of Taney, and the second half of Taney. The first half of Taney consisted of the present-day parish of Rathfarnham; and it was so called because it belonged to the old Irish and more ancient diocese of Glendalough. Whereas the second half of Taney, though close to the first half, was part and parcel of the younger Danish diocese of Dublin. The second half of Taney extended over and comprised the present-day parish of Dundrum, Roebuck, and Stillorgan. And to this day the Protestant church of this parish is called the Church of Taney. Lastly, in comparing the two names, *Athicip* and *Techdologa*, we can conclude that they both meant one and the same territory; and that of the two, *Techdologa* was the older and more ancient designation of one and the same parish.

## 2. *Ballivodrach, Ballivodram.*

It may be said that these two names are identical in both Bull and charter. They are the original Irish form of the present-day name of Ballymurphy or Murphystown, which is situate next to Leopardstown (of race-course fame), and quite near to and just in view of the Catholic church of Sandyford. There is a very strong suspicion that the name itself of Sandyford is traceable, through some process of crystallization, to this old Irish name of Ballyvodrack, or Ballyvodram. For there is one unmistakable fact in this locality of Sandyford that argues most strongly in favour of this suspicion; there is no sandhill, nor sandbank, nor flowing river, nor good-sized stream even, to give the slightest warranty that once upon a time in the olden days there was a ford of the sandy nature meant by this name Sandyford. Neither could geologists nor historians undertake to claim that at any period, even the most remote, there was any such unmistakable Sandyford.

## 3. *Cellopscupedan, Cellescoibsilleam.*

These two ancient words are also identical. Of the two, the second is a nearer approach to the more correct form.

The first is a manifest corruption. Both mean the Church of the Seven Bishops. In the old annals of Ireland, and in several histories and biographies, Tully or Tullystown is spoken of as Tully of the Seven Bishops. There is no difficulty, then, in identifying these titles with the parish of Kill and Tullystown.

4. *Senekil, Ballyfind, Glenmuneri.*

Here two granges are bracketed together. Both Senekil and Ballyfind correspond to the older denomination Glenmuneri. This latter title after many changes still survives in the name of Ballyman, which is within the old parish of Old Connaught. And this parish of Old Connaught has been always famous for the ruins of an old church dedicated to St. Kevin himself, and situate in a lovely spot within its bounds.

5. *Erman, Celladgair.*

These titles, seemingly, are quite different one from the other. Yet if we prefix to the first title the two syllables Killeg, and add the two syllables Ister to it as well, thus — Killeg-erman-ister, we at once reconcile our two titles, and make them almost identical, viz., Killegar and Manister, or Monastery. To this present day, these two names, Killegar and Monastery are a living tradition in the parish of Enniskerry.

6. *Cellguoe, Cell mo mothenoe.*

The first of these two is a manifest blunder, and a clumsy contraction of the second. The second is a partial or a slight misspelling of the old Irish form of the name of Kil-maccanogue, or the Church of St. Canoe, a holy hermit from Wales, who lived in this neighbourhood, and under the shadow of the Sugar Loaf mountain as early as the age of St. Kevin himself.

7. *Thehugonuauill, Villa Udenetha.*

These two also differ in appearance. The first word is an obvious misspelling for Teach or Steach Connaill. And the name has come down to the present day in the shape of Stagonilly. And this Stagonilly has been always recognised

as the territory of the present parish of Bray, Old Rathdown, and Temple Carriek.

### 8. *Disert Cellaig, Deirgne.*

The first word of the first name, Disert, should remind us that there were other Diserts besides this one, within and throughout the diocese of Glendalough. There was, for example, Disert Diarmuid in the district of Ui Muirethaigle (No. 5), and known as Castledermott. There was, Disert Iollaun in the district of Ui Faelan (No. 6), and now known as Castle Dillon, situate on the banks of the Liffey, and within the parish bounds of Celbridge. There was also Disert Cennhghin in Glendalough valley itself. And we shall see just now in our next district (No. 9) the faintest traces of another Disert under the form of Ered. All these Diserts, as well as our present Disert Cellaig, were the homes and sanctuaries of most holy and most famous saints. As regards the epithet Cellaig, the second word of Disert Cellaig, we had it before in the title of district No. 7, *i.e.*, Ui Ceallach Cualan. There is no doubt that this saint of Disert Callaig must have been one of the royal house who ruled over the Ui Ceallach Cualan in the earlier centuries, subsequent to St. Kevin's time. Near Delgany there is a spot still called Fearanna Kelly, and near Kilguade there is the very old town of Kilcoole. Both Fearanna Kelly and Kilcoole are merely refinements in spelling and pronunciation of the old designation Disert Cellaig. And Disert Cellaig means the same extent of territory as did Deirgni of the charter—viz., the parish of Delgany, Kilguade, and Kilcoole. It must not be forgotten, however, that even Deirgni itself had its own great saint, as well as Disert College.

A St. Mogoroc is mentioned in all the Lives of St. Kevin. This St. Mogoroc it was who attended St. Kevin in his dying moments and anointed him, and closed his eyes on that holy occasion. The home of St. Mogoroc is spoken of as being at Deirgni; and oftentimes the phrase Deirgni-Mogoroc is met with, as being situate to the east or north-east of Glendalough. There is another place in the same neighbourhood mentioned in connection with this saint's name—

Cooleretimoroke. This, of course, simply means Calery of St. Mogoroc. It would seem, too, that this St. Mogoroc was also brother of St. Cannoc of Kilmacanogue, and that both brothers lived not only quite close to one another, but within the very shadows of the great Sugar Loaf mountain—the one on the north side, and the other on the south side. It can be claimed, moreover, that not merely at the moment of dying did St. Mogoroc have the honour of attending on the angelic Kevin, but all through life as well he shared and enjoyed the saint's esteem and affection. On many occasions the two saints exchanged visits with each other, and St. Mogoroc most frequently acted as confessor and counsellor to the holy founder of Glendalough.

#### *9. Acad Cluan Melechain—Cell Maccubinriun.*

History has it that in the very early centuries of our Christian era (say the third and fourth, long before the days of St. Kevin) the whole of Cualan, from the Liffey at Dublin to beyond the Big Water at Arklow, was called Ui Briun Cualan, in honour of the first founder of the race Brian Ieth Derg. This Brian was one of the Ui Dunlaing (or O'Dowlings), the rulers of North Leinster from the old city of Naas. We have clear and unmistakable traces of this first settlement of Brian and his people in the Ui Briun Cualan at Boherna Breenagh and its neighbourhood. These Ui Briun continued to hold sway in this portion of Cualan till near the eighth century, when they were superseded and dislodged by the Ui Donchada, and obliged to migrate and gather together into another and smaller settlement along the sea-coast. In the course of years, even here, they grew smaller and smaller and their settlement became more confined; and yet, throughout all their many changes, they ever maintained themselves as a distinct and separate people—as a distinct and separate portion of the diocese of Glendalough, having a church and a territory wholly to themselves. Hence it has come to pass that in the twelfth century the charter of Strongbow designated them as the Cell Maccu Binriun, *i.e.* Cell mic Ui Briun, or the church of the Ui Briun. And likewise the Papal Bull constituted



them and styled them as a distinct grange—one of the ten granges of the Cualan of Kevin under the form of Acad Cluan Malechain. In the third of these words, viz., Malechain, the letters “ ch ” are not sounded, and if we substitute Cell for Cluan, we at once have the ford of the church of Malean or Mullin ; in other words, Kilmullin, which to this day is within the bounds of Newcastle parish. A curious coincidence is noticeable in connection with this Newcastle. In ages long after the twelfth century, in came to be called in plain English, the O’Byrne’s country. This was not because of the Ui Briun surviving to those days. It was because the O’Byrnes of Ui Faelan (No. 6) were driven out of their own territory by the Norman conquerors in the thirteenth century, and forced to intrude themselves on the lands of the former Ui Briun and thus to settle themselves amid the hills and lowlands of Newcastle.

#### 10.—*Et in terra de Wyglo.*

We now come to consider the next district (No. 10), or the land of Wyglo. This antique terra de Wyglo is the old form of our modern word Wicklow. And as it stands in the charter (terra de Wyglo), it was not by any means co-extensive with our present county of Wicklow. On the contrary it was of a much more limited extent by many degrees. In the twelfth century, and before it, this district, began at the southern bounds of our last described district No. 9, *i.e.* at the bounds of the present parish of Newcastle, and stretched away inland and along the coast as far as the left bank of the Big Water, or the now well-known Avonmore River. This Big Water, it may be remarked, was and is still, the union of the four or five watersheds that are gathered into the several basins—1, of the two lakes at Glendalough ; 2, of Lough Nehaangan ; 3, of Kowgh ; 4, of Lough Dan ; 5, of Lough Tay, or Luggelaw ; and these meeting together below Lara, just at the foot of Troopers-town Hill, right at the opening of the Vale of Clara, they form there a single rapid rushing river, now called the Avonmore. This river, flowing by Rathdrum, and on through the Vale of Oroca, reaches the sea at Arklow. It may also

be remarked that in the twelfth century, and for ages before it, this Big Water was the division line between the terra de Wyglo and the terra de Arclo. The terra de Wyglo lay on the left bank, and that of the Arclo on the right bank. This will appear the more evident when we localize the eleven churches attributed to the district of Wyglo by the charter.

The first on the list is Cell Molibbo—the church of St. Molibbo, or of St. Livinius. This saint was a nephew of St. Kevin, a sister's child. He was educated and trained to virtue and sanctity within the holy precincts of Glendalough Abbey, under the loving personal care of the sanctified founder himself. In due course he was advanced to the priesthood; and very soon after, so conspicuous did he become for perfection and erudition, he was elevated to the episcopacy, and constituted first bishop of Glendalough diocese. He was seized subsequently with a burning zeal to go and preach the Gospel of Christ in foreign and pagan lands; and so overwhelming to his heart did this zeal become, that he craved of the Abbot Kevin to be released of his charge and be permitted to go abroad. St. Kevin did permit him; and Livinius took with him three monks of the Abbey, as companion priests, and set forth on his mission. For years he and they laboured amongst the savage hordes of ancient Flanders. Eventually, Livinius himself ended his career amidst the sufferings of a most glorious martyrdom. And Glendalough did not forget to do honour to its noble missionary and first bishop. Our charter assures us that the first church in the terra de Wyglo was dedicated to God's worship under the invocation of St. Livinius or St. Molibbo. The Bull of Alexander seems to assure us where was situated this Cell Molibbo, viz., on Kilmantan Hill.

The second church is Ered-Mochae. The first five letters of this word (as observed before) are very suggestive of the term disert or disertum. It is possible, too, there may be many a confusing like of the word Druim. It is not easy to say what the remaining letters mochae or ochae mean; but taken with Druim, they are recognisable in Drunkay. However, it is equally possible that both the

Disertum and the Druim are traceable somewhere within the extent of the modern parish of Rathnew.

The third church is termed Cell maccubuadan. This was the ancient way of styling what in later times used to be called Inisboethin. And it is on record that up to a hundred years ago, and later, the present-day parish of Dunganstown or Baradarig was known and spoken of as Inish Boyne or Ennishboheen. The Bull of Alexander mentions it as Innisboethen, the inch of St. Boethen. This St. Boethen lived and laboured in the days of St. Kevin himself. He founded a monastery, and had under him a numerous community of holy monks. St. Kevin often journeyed thither from Glendalough and visited them. After St. Boethen's death the people of the country around this monastery cherished his memory by placing themselves under his patronage, and for ages after, they and their church were recognised as the Cell mic Ua Boethin, or Cell maccubuadan.

The fourth church given is Invernacli. The Papal Bull mentions it as Inverdale. The more correct form of the two is Inbhir Daoile. This Inbhir Daoile is celebrated for many historical events, and, like Inisboethin, for its monastic foundation in the age immediately succeeding St. Kevin's. In connection with this foundation, St. Dagan, a near relative of St. Kevin, acquired great fame and honour. As a territory, Inbherdaoile stretched along the sea-coast from the neighbourhood of Redcross and the bounds of Inisboethin, down to what is now called Ferrybank. The first beginnings of Inbher Daoile are still traceable at Ennereilly, and the original site of St. Dagan's foundation are quite perceptible there. All writers are agreed that the word Ennereilly comes from Inbherdaoile by some mysterious process of crystallization.

The fifth church is Cellbritton. This church, now called Kilbride, extended over the territory between the bounds of Inbherdaoile and the left bank of the Avonmore or Big Water, which is here nowadays called the Ovoca river. It included the modern Shelton Abbey, Ballyarthur, Newbridge, and Tigroney. It must be borne in mind, however, that Kilbride, the modern form of Cellbritton, does not

mean that this old church was dedicated to the honour of the saint of the men of *Ui Failghe*. On the contrary, St. Brigid had nothing whatever to do with this Kilbride. Cellbritton is a contraction of *Cellna Brettonach*, the church of the strangers, or of the foreigners, or of those who came over the sea.

Here we have a strong confirmation of the old time tradition that the Big Water at its mouth (*Inbhir more*) was for ages a port of calling, and its neighbourhood a place of great resort and trading for foreigners from all parts of the world. Here, too, the first apostle of Ireland, Palladius, touched our shores, and entering the *Inbhir more*, sailed up the Big Water, and made his first landing and his first settlement at Tigroney, or the *Teach na Romani*, which is now not very far from the Catholic church in Ovoca.

The sixth church is *Cnoc loigus echane*. Under this denomination was included *Cronebane* and all that part of Upper Castle Macadam which lies on the left bank of the Big Water, and the territory of Ballydonnell as well.

The seventh church is called *Glenfadli*. This title is most easy of recognition in the modern and well-known name of Glenealy. There is every reason for thinking that this *Glenfadli* included within its bounds the church of Kilcommon as well.

The eighth church bears the name of *Rubascologe*. The nearest and the only approach to this in the modern form is the well-known church of Killusky. The Bull of Alexander calls it *Cellusquedi ecclesia*, and tells us that within the near neighbourhood of this Kilusky was also the church of *Cellocthuir*.

The ninth church given is *Achad Caracone*. In this we can recognise the unmistakably old church of Kilfy, which is to be seen to this day near the ford of the Vartry at Nun's Cross bridge, and not very far from the Ashford entrance to the celebrated Devil's Glen. The Papal Bull speaks of *Cell Pichi ecclesia*. If we treat this word as the old Irish did, *i.e.*, pronounce the letter "p" as "f," and scarcely sound the letters "ch," we at once have *Cellfii*, or Kilfy.



The tenth church is Cullen. And this is the well-known territory of Ballycullen, lying to the west of Kilfy and Glenealy.

The eleventh church is named Baccuaser. This is the last church on the list, as given in the charter, and as being within the terra de Wyglo. Outside and beyond the last two churches lies a territory stretching from the bounds of Killusky and Newcastle parishes on the north, away down to the left bank of the Big Water on the south. This territory can be at once recognised by including within it the modern names of Moneystown, Croneybyrne, Troopers-town and Clara. This is the territory that seems likeliest to have been called Baccuasseri in Strongbow's charter. There is not a word about it in the Papal Bull. In one of the records of the sixteenth century, this very territory, as just outlined above, is designated "*Ecclesia de Kilmethur cum capella de villa de Citharea.*" This is evidently a tradition of things as they stood in the twelfth century. It appears that Villa de Citharea and Harpstown are the English and Latin rendering of the original Irish name of Clara, *i.e.*, Clairseach. Methur, the second half of the word Kilmethur, is the Irish for park. And to this day there are two large townlands in Moniestown, called Parkmore and Parkroe.

A detailed list of these churches is now appended as in the case of the other districts :—

STRONGBOW'S CHARTER. PAPAL BULL.

1. Cell Molibbo	Cell Manton (Wicklow Town)
2. Ered Mochae	(Drumkay & Rathnew)
3. Cell Maecu buddan	Inisboethin (Danganstown & Barndarrig)
4. Invernaeli	Inverdele (Redcross & Ennereilly)
5. Cellbritton	(Kilbride & Tigroney)
6. Cnoc loigusechene	(Cronebane & BallyDonnell)
7. Glenfadli	(Kilcommon & Glenealy)
8. Rubanscologe	(Collusguedin)
	(Cellocthiur) (Killusky & Killocthur)
9. Acadcaracone	Cellpeche (Kilfy)
10. Cullen	(Ballycullen)
11. Baccuaseri	(Moneystown, Croneybyrne)
	(Trooperstown & Clara)

Before concluding our remarks upon the *terra de Wyglo*, attention must be drawn to a very remarkable omission in the Bull of Alexander III. (1179). There is no mention made whatever of churches 2 or 7—viz., Rathnew and Glenealy. But, curious to relate, there is express allusion made to our nation's patron saint instead, under the form of *Leth Padruic*. Tradition has it, that St. Patrick, like St. Palladius, landed, as our apostle, on Ireland's shores somewhere on the coast of Cualan. In speaking of Kilbride and Tigronev we have laid it down as almost certain that St. Palladius entered the Inbhir-more, sailed up the Ovoca, and landed and first settled on the left bank of the Big Water at Tigronev. Would it not be equally likely that St. Patrick steered his small craft into Wicklow harbour, and sojourning and resting awhile within the immediate country of Rathnew or Glenealy, and leaving there his blessing and the first gift of the holy faith, the people in consequence had themselves called the children of St. Patrick by pre-eminence, and dedicated themselves and their lands as the portion and property of their nation's apostle? Hence, seemingly, the name *Leth Padruic*. This title was worn and borne from age to age as a tradition.

In the twelfth century Rome came to know of it, and gave it its sanction by inscribing *Leth Paudric* in the Bull of Alexander III., *i.e.*, St. Patrick's inheritance, as the special title of the people of Rathnew or Glenealy parishes.

### 11. *Et in terra de Arclo.*

We have now come to consider and get acquainted with the churches of the last district of the old diocese of Glendalough; viz., the *terra de Arclo*. Arclo itself dates from a very remote age of history. It was originally founded in the days of the first coming of the Milesians. Its full name was Tullac Arclogh Inbhir-more. The town stands at the Inbhir-more, or the estuary of the Avonmore. The territory of the district (or *terra de Arclo*) lay wholly on the right bank of the Big Water from the Inbhir-more itself up to Derry bawn, a mountain overlooking Glendalough on the south-east. The number of churches mentioned in the charter is ten;

whereas those detailed in the Bull amount only to eight. Here follows the list in both cases :—

STRONGBOW'S CHARTER	BULL OF ALEXANDER III.	
1. Ballumeill	Celltamlacha	} (Arklow.)
2. Carrie Coccaille		
3. Cell Biesigi	Cell biesigi	
4. Cell nupodi	4 Cell Gormayne	(Kilgorman.)
5. Cell Modicu	5 Inish Mocholmog	(Inch.)
6. Ui Cassaille	6 Calcassail	(Lower Castle McAdam.)
7. Cell Fionmagi	7 Cell Fumnaegi	(Ballinaclash and Whaley Abbey.)
8. Centure	} Domach righnagi	(Ballykine and Aughrim.)
9. Clegriachane		(Rossehane and Aughavanna.)
10. Acaderuachane		(Knockrath and Rathdrum.)

1, 2, 3. These first three churches are not at once recognisable. Most probably they constituted the immediate surroundings of Arklow itself.

4. Cellnupodi—Cellgormanyne. This is the ancient parish of Kilgorman to the south of Arklow, and extending along the sea coast.

5. Cellmodicu—Inis Mocholmog. No particulars of these denominations are to be met with anywhere. The parish, however, still goes by the name of Inch; and the famous gold mines are within its bounds.

6. Cellcassasle—Cellcassail. This church is nowadays included in the modern parish of Lower Castle Macadam on the right bank of the Big Water, and includes the glens and valleys of Wooden Bridge.

### *7. Cell Fionmagi, Cell Fumnaëgo.*

This was a most celebrated monastic foundation. It is said to have been established by one of the two St. Abbans of Leinster, in the sixth century; and many of the great saints of the eighth century belonged to it. Even the saint of Moereddin was one of its holy monks. In the ancient calendars, and especially in the *Felire of Aengus*, this cell, *Fiona magi*, is described as being in the territory of the

Ui Eínechghlais. This territory lay on the right bank of the Big Water from near Arklow to Glenmalure. And in the present-day name of Clash we have an undoubted survival of the chief settlement of these Ui Eínechghlais. This church is situated quite near to the first "meeting of the waters," which is only the meeting of the big and little waters, the Avonmore and the Avonbeg. And in the near neighbourhood of this meeting, both of the waters and of Clash, there stands to this day the ruins of a very ancient abbey, which now goes by the name of Whaley Abbey. Unhesitatingly we now say that this *Cell fionn Magh* was located in the neighbourhood of this Ballinaclash, and stood on the surroundings of the present site of Whaley Abbey.

The 8, 9, and 10 churches of the charter are summed into one by the Bull of Alexander. It is very remarkable that these same churches remained united as one parish even unto modern times, and up to a few years ago.

JAMES MANNING, P.P.

## Theological Questions.

### QUESTIONS REGARDING THE BAPTISM OF ADULTS AND THE CELEBRATION OF CERTAIN MASSES.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly help one of your subscribers by answering in the next number of the I. E. RECORD the following questions:—

"(a) At what age do children become adults *in ordine ad Baptismum*, so that the "term for adults" should be used when baptizing them? Is it seven, or twenty-one, or some intervening period?

"(b) I am a member of an Infirm Clergy Fund. This fund is supported by benefactors for whom a certain number of Masses must be said as laid down in our rules. The number of Masses each member of this fund has to say per annum is pretty large, varying from twenty-five to forty. The members receive nothing



*hic et nunc* for saying these Masses, but should they get unfit for work either through infirmity or old age, or any other reason, *citra censuram*, they receive a certain sum—a sustenance—out of this fund. Is the obligation to say these Masses an *obligatio justitiæ vel saltem quasi justitiæ*, or is it merely an *obligatio caritatis*? I know full well there is an *obligatio*, but is it *ex justitia vel ex caritate*?

“(c) In our Faculty to celebrate Mass *his in eodem die Dom vel Fest. de praecepto*, occurs this clause: “*Servato . . . et Decreto S. C. C. dici 25 Sept. 1858, de elemosyna non accipienda pro Secunda Missa.*” What is the precise meaning of this phrase? (I am supposing that the celebrant is not a *parochus*, and therefore is not bound to say any Mass for his parishioners.) (a) Does it mean that a priest who has duplicating Faculties, and has to say two Masses to supply the wants of his people, if he did not have a stipendium for the first Mass, can lawfully accept one for the second? (b) Or does it mean, with or without a stipendium for the first Mass, he is forbidden to accept one for the second. Lehmkuhl, No. 215, 4, Edit. 4<sup>a</sup>, page 161, and Gury, as there cited, touch the question; and my reading of the passage in both authors left me under the impression, that with or without a stipendium for the first Mass, he cannot (by virtue of this decree) accept a stipendium for the second.

“But others, and among them some whose opinion is considered of great weight, take the opposite view, and say that “if the first Mass was offered for a free intention, or for one due out of charity merely, there will be nothing to hinder a stipend being taken for the second Mass.”

“Kindly say which, in the opinion of the I. E. RECORD, is the correct interpretation of this decree, and oblige

“IGNORANS.”

## I.

In reply to our correspondent's first question, we beg to say that children become adults *in ordine ad baptismum* as soon as they come to the use of reason, and, therefore, about the age of seven years. For the valid reception of the sacrament they must then have the *intention* of receiving it; and the form for adults must be used. “By the word *adult* we are here to understand anyone who has attained the perfect use of reason—‘*qui adulta state sunt, et perfectum*

rationis usum habent.'<sup>1</sup> This is presumed with regard to all who have completed their seventh year."<sup>2</sup>

## II.

Our correspondent's second question becomes especially important in connection with bination. All priests, who are members of the Infirm Clergy Fund, are certainly bound to say these Masses. But if the obligation is one of charity, or fidelity, or obedience, it can be fulfilled by offering the second Mass on Sundays and holidays for the benefactors of the fund; whereas, if there is an obligation of justice, a priest, who gets a honorarium for his first Mass, cannot offer his second Mass in fulfilment of this obligation. These points have been all decided by decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. By the common law of the Church, therefore, a priest who gets a honorarium for his first Mass on Sundays, may not accept a honorarium for his second Mass. Similarly, a parish priest, who offers his first Mass *pro populo* may not accept a honorarium for the second. But a priest may fulfil an obligation of charity by his second Mass, notwithstanding that he may have received a honorarium for his first Mass. Hence, *e. g.*, if a number of priests belong to an association whose rules require that Mass should be said for a deceased member, the second Mass on Sunday may be applied for this purpose, though the first be offered to fulfil an obligation in justice.

To come to our correspondent's question, it is impossible for us to give a very definite answer, as we are not acquainted with the nature and terms of the different donations. We may conceive many hypotheses. (a) A benefactor may leave money to the Infirm Clergy Fund with an obligation of having Masses said; and then, of course, the application of the Masses would be due in justice. In this way people often leave money to convents and other charities. (b) The money may be given by a person who expressly excludes the obligation of Masses; or by one who is unaware that Masses are said for deceased benefactors;

<sup>1</sup> Catech. Conc. Trid., pars ii., cap. ii., De Baptismo, n. 32.

<sup>2</sup> O'Kane on the Rubrics, n. 424.

and then there is no obligation, unless it be imposed by ecclesiastical law. But (c) a difficulty arises when, as usually happens, a person who is aware that Masses are said for the benefactors of the fund, gives a certain amount of money, and neither expressly imposes nor excludes the obligation of Masses. A similar difficulty arises in connection with various advertisements soliciting aid for churches, convents, schools, &c., and promising that Masses will be said at certain times for all the charitable donors. In this, as in the first hypothesis, we think that an obligation of justice *could* arise; because though a number of the priests may never require aid from the Infirm Fund, and may never receive any actual emolument for the Masses said for the benefactors, still they acquire a *right* to sustenance in case they should become infirm. But though an obligation of justice *could* arise, we think that in this third hypothesis, until there be an authoritative ruling to the contrary, priests may safely hold that there is no obligation in justice, and that their benefactors give their money not as a honorarium for Masses, but as a contribution to a most deserving charity, impelled indeed, perhaps, by the consideration that this form of charity will be rewarded with a share in the promised Masses. Hence we think that, until there be a decree to the contrary, the obligation may be regarded as one of charity and fidelity to the promises made, and obedience to the law of the bishop. And this obligation can be fulfilled by offering the second Mass on Sundays for the benefactors, even if the first had been offered in fulfilment of an obligation in justice.

### III.

The common law of the Church, as interpreted by various decisions of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, forbids a second honorarium to be taken when a priest says a second Mass on Sundays or holidays: "*Firma semper manente prohibitione accipiendi stipendium pro secunda Missa.*" What, our correspondent asks, is the precise meaning of this phrase, "*pro secunda Missa*"? This prohibition comes from ecclesiastical law; and though the words appear to be

absolute, and to forbid a honorarium for the second Mass in every case, still we think that a honorarium may be taken for the second Mass, if the first Mass were not applied in fulfilment of an obligation in justice. Our reason is, because, in all the decrees which forbid a priest to take honorarium for his second Mass, it seems to be assumed that he would have received a honorarium for his first Mass, or that he would have satisfied an obligation of justice, or quasi-justice, *e.g.*, the pastoral obligation of offering Mass *pro populo*. Hence, we think the decrees do not contemplate the case where no honorarium is received for the first Mass; and that, until there be a decree contemplating this special phase of the question, a priest may take a honorarium for his second Mass, if his first Mass were not offered to satisfy an obligation in justice.

This interpretation of the ecclesiastical law on the matter, and of the various decisions referred to, is clearly intimated in Varceno,<sup>1</sup> in the following passage:—"Qui binas Missas celebrat non potest duplicatum stipendium accipere . . . Neque secunda Missa, *quando prima fuit applicata ad satisfaciendum onus ex justitia*, poterit applicari pro satisfactione alterius oneris pariter ex justitia." It would appear, therefore, that in the present condition of the law on the matter, and until a more extensive decision be given, a priest may take a honorarium for his second Mass whenever he has not satisfied an obligation in justice by his first Mass.

D. COGILAN.

<sup>1</sup> Tom. ii., page 90.



## Liturgical Questions.

---

### I.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be glad to have Father O’Loan’s opinion on the two following points :—

“1. I have been looking through his work entitled, *Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*. On page 153, writing on ‘Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament,’ he says : ‘The officiant may be assisted merely by clerks, or by a priest or deacon in addition to the clerks, or by a deacon and sub-deacon, with torch-bearers, &c. In the first two cases the officiant may vest either *in surplice, stole, and cope* ; or, better still, in amice, alb, girdle, stole, and cope.’ In a note to the words I have underlined he says :—‘ Baldeschi would have the officiant put on an amice with the surplice. This, however, seems to be entirely contrary to custom, and is not recommended by any other writer whose work we have at hand.’ Since I first read these words I have been unable to dismiss them from my mind. There seems to be something wrong somehow. I do not think it is contrary to custom, in this country anyhow, to *wear the amice with the surplice* at Benediction. As far as I know, priests generally, if not invariably, wear *both*, when they do not wear the amice, alb, &c. And they have excellent warrant for doing so. The ‘*Ritus servandus in Expositione et Benedictione Sanctissimi Sacramenti*’ (Edinburgi : Joannes Chisholm, 65, Lothian-road) absolutely justifies their action. The work has the *Imprimatur* of ‘✠ Joannes Episc. Abilensis, D. Orient. Scotiae, V.A.,’ who, after the restoration of the hierarchy, was known as Archbishop Strain. In the ‘*Praenotanda*’ are found the following :—‘Cum plurimi, diversique ritus inter nos irrepserint, in Benedictione cum SS. Sacramento impertienda, Vicariis Apostolicis visum est, et Divini cultus dedecori, et fidelium aedificationi consultum fore, si unicus tantum modus tam sacrum peragendi opus ubique locorum constitueretur. Quapropter sequentes regulas *in eo observandas, primum a peritissimis viris apud nos summo studio elaboratas, in ipsa alma Urbe, ab uno ex ceremoniariis pontificiis emendari illustrarique curaverant.*’ On

page 8, we read: 'In Sacristia parentur . . . cotta et amictus et pluvialis albi colorio pro sacerdote principale, qui daturus est benedictionem; qui tamen decens est amictu, alba, cingulo,' &c. Now what is the authority quoted in a footnote for the wearing of the amice? Not Baldeschi, but the 'Ceremoniale Episcoporum.' It may be added that in Valuy's *Directorium Sacerdotali* (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1887), the following words are found:—'The Alb is recommended as more becoming at Benediction. But the surplice may be used. In either case the amice must be worn.' The 'Ritus servandus' is here quoted. Be it observed that this is not the work I have above referred to, but the *Ritus* in use in England, which was issued, I believe, at the instance of the last Provincial Synod of Westminster. We, therefore, find that not only Baldeschi, but two works which all the priests in England and Scotland are bound to follow, prescribe the wearing of the amice at Benediction even when the surplice, and not the alb, &c., is used. I would like very much that something should be said on this point in an early number of the I. E. RECORD.

2. At page 158 of *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, occur the following words:—'Having placed the monstrance on the corporal, the officiant genuflects on one knee on the predella, while one of the clerks removes the veil from his shoulders.' In this country, and also, I believe, in England, the priest after replacing the monstrance on the altar, before putting the lunette in the tabernacle, descends to the foot of the altar, and there—alternately with the assembled faithful—recites aloud the 'Divine Praises':—

'Blessed be God.

Blessed be His holy Name.

Blessed be Jesus Christ, true God and true man.

Blessed be the name of Jesus.

Blessed be Jesus in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar.

Blessed be the great mother of God, Mary most holy.

Blessed be her holy and Immaculate Conception.

Blessed be the name of Mary, virgin and mother.

Blessed be God in His Angels and in His Saints.'

Now what I wish to know is this. Would it be rubrical, after replacing the monstrance on the altar, to genuflect on the predella and descend *in plano*, before the removal of the humeral veil? I should very much like an expression of opinion on this last point also. The difference between the two cases is this,

If the 'Divine Praises' are not recited, the lunette is immediately restored to the tabernacle, and it is easy to see in this case why the humeral veil should be removed from the officiant's shoulders whilst he genuflects on the predella. But when the 'Divine Praises' are recited, the officiant descends to the foot of the altar in any case. I know that with us many, if not most, priests have the humeral veil removed only when they have descended *in plano* to recite the Divine Praises.

"AN IRISH PRIEST IN SCOTLAND."

1. I have great pleasure in expressing my opinion on the difficulties raised in the foregoing communication. The difficulties are two in number, and have been excited by certain statements made in *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*. The first regards the vestments to be worn by a priest in giving Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament, when he is not assisted by a deacon and sub-deacon; the second relates to the time and place in which the humeral veil should be removed from the shoulders of the officiant after Benediction. With regard to the former of these two difficulties, the book referred to states that it is contrary to custom for the officiant to wear an amice along with a surplice, and that this practice is not recommended by any author whose works the writer of the book in question had in hand, with the exception of Baldeschi. Against this statement it is now urged—(1) that it is customary in Scotland and England for the officiant at Benediction to wear the amice along with the surplice; (2) that this custom is sanctioned by the *Ritus Servandus* of each country; and (3) that Valuy asserts that the amice *must* be worn with the surplice.

Now, if it be borne in mind that *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions* does not condemn as *wrong* the practice of wearing the amice and surplice, and that it does not state that *no* writer ever recommended this practice, this first difficulty disappears. A custom which prevails only in Scotland and England, is not, surely, to be regarded as a custom of the Universal Church; but the word "custom" in the paragraph which has excited this difficulty, is used in this latter sense. Hence though it is customary

to wear the amice and surplice in Scotland and England, when giving Benediction, if this custom is confined to these countries, it is still true to say that it is contrary to the custom of the Church in general. And that this custom is practically confined to the countries in question, I infer from my own experience, from the experience of others with whom I have conversed on the subject, but chiefly from books. I have before me at present books published in America, Germany, Belgium, France, and various places in Italy, including Rome itself, and not a single one of them gives even a hint that the amice should be worn along with the surplice by a priest giving Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament. On the contrary, they all state as a matter quite settled, and outside the pale of controversy or doubt, that the vestments to be worn by a priest giving Benediction, when not assisted by sacred ministers, are simply the surplice, stole, and cope, though some mention as an alternative the amice, alb, cincture, stole, and cope. I will quote the words of a few of the best known of these writers:—

“Clericus . . . adjuvabit Parochum in induendis paramentis, nempe *superpelliceo, stola et parviali.*” (Martinucci, l. 3. c. 8, *De Expositione et Benedictione cum SS. Sacramento*, n. 14, 31.)

“Sacerdos super *superpellicem stolum induit ac pluviale.*” (De Carpo, Pars. 3, c. 14, art. 2.)

“Le prêtre qui doit chanter le salut portera *le surplis* ou s’il est chanoine le rochet, *avec l’étole et la chape.*” (Falise, sect. 3, chap. 4, § 3, n. 6.)

“Sacerdos (officiarius) *indutus superpelliceo stola et pluviali accedit ad altare.*” (Wapelhorst, n. 217.)

Enough has now been said to vindicate the statement made in *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, which has created the present difficulty. As I have already hinted, that statement does not come into collision with either the *Ritus Servandus* of England or Scotland, or with Valuy. Not with the former, because to say that a practice is not in accordance with general custom, is not by any means to condemn such practice. Moreover, when for the sake of uniformity a practice of this kind is prescribed by the ecclesiastical authorities of a country, to follow it is not only



lawful, but it is of obligation, in so far as the bishops of the country wished to make it obligatory. Nor with the latter, because I have never yet been the fortunate possessor of a copy of Valuy's *Directorium*, which, however, I am not bound to regard as a profound authority on the ceremonies of the Church.

Reference has been made by our correspondent to the authority of the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum*, but I am of opinion that he will gain very little support from it. I shall be happy, however, to receive from him a reference to any statement in it, which seems to contradict the statement I am trying to defend.

2. The second question proposed by our correspondent presents no difficulty. Indeed, he himself has practically answered it. It is quite in accordance with ceremonial practice for the officiant to retain the humeral veil until he comes to the foot of the altar in the circumstances referred to. It is only when the Host is to be placed in the tabernacle by the officiant, immediately after Benediction, that the humeral veil is to be removed when he genuflects on the predella. And, even in this case, it is convenience rather than obligation that dictates the practice. In all other cases, it is preferable that the officiant, after genuflecting on the predella, should descend and kneel on the first step before the veil is removed.

## II.

### QUESTIONS REGARDING CRUCIFIXES INDULGENCED FOR THE "VIA CRUCIS."

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly let me know the conditions required for gaining the indulgence of the 'Via Crucis' when one uses a crucifix instead of visiting the Stations canonically erected? Please state also, whether a crucifix indulgenced for the 'Via Crucis' can lose the indulgence, and if so, in what circumstances.

"INQUIRER."

I. To gain the indulgences of the "Via Crucis," by using a crucifix instead of visiting the fourteen Stations canonically erected, certain conditions are required—(1) on the part of the crucifix; (2) on the part of the person using it.

1. On the part of the crucifix, the following three conditions are required:—

(a) The crucifix must be a real crucifix, and not a simple cross. The figure of our Lord must be in relief, or raised above the surface of the cross; but it is not necessary that the figure should be detachable from the cross.

(b) The figure must be of some solid substance, not easily broken, such as metal or wood.

(c) The crucifix must be blessed by a priest having the necessary faculties.

2. On the part of the person using the crucifix, several conditions are also required.

(a) It must be difficult, if not morally impossible, for him to perform the devotion of the Way of the Cross in the ordinary manner; that is, by visiting the Stations canonically erected. Sickness, bad weather, distance, occupation, or other legitimate impediment, will constitute the necessary "difficulty" or "moral impossibility."

(b) The person must say attentively and devoutly twenty Our Fathers and Hail Marys. Of these the first fourteen are for the fourteen stations; the five following are in honour of the Five Wounds; and the remaining one is for the intention of our Holy Father. It is not necessary, however, to advert to this distribution.

(c) These prayers must be said *unico tractu*; that is, without any moral interruption.

(d) The crucifix must be held in the hand during the recital of the prayers. But when a number say the prayers in common, it is sufficient if one of them have a crucifix, and hold it in his hand; all will then gain the indulgences, as if each had a crucifix.

II. The crucifix loses the indulgences—

(a) If the *figure of Christ* gets broken. It is to the figure affixed to the cross, not to the cross itself, nor even to the figure and cross united, that the indulgences are attached. Hence, if the *cross* gets broken, the *figure* can be affixed to another cross without losing the indulgences.

(b) If the ownership of the crucifix be transferred from the person who first used it as his own after it was blessed,

or if it be lent to another, *that that other may gain the indulgences*, it loses the indulgences. Hence if a crucifix is sold, given away *after having been used*, or having been lost by the original owner, is found by another, it ceases to be indulgenced. But if a person gets a crucifix blessed for himself, and before using it, bestows it to a friend, the indulgences remain attached to it. Similarly, if without the knowledge or consent of the owner the crucifix be used by another, even with the intention of gaining the indulgences, it still remains indulgenced.

D. O'LOAN.

## Correspondence.

### THE FIRST PRAYER IN THE "MISSA QUOTIDIANA."

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Permit me to observe that De Herdt must have made a strange mistake when he argues from the case discussed at the Academia Liturgica in Rome, June 23rd, 1858, as if it implied any uncertainty as to the obligation of reciting the *Deus qui inter apostolicos sacerdotes*, as the first prayer in the *Missa Quotidiana*.

"The case is given with a number of other like cases, as in our diocesan conferences, as a subject of discussion for such as might not have been previously well made up on the matter, and not as if it had remained undecided.

"As a matter of fact, the liturgical text-book made use of at the time in Rome by the students of the Propaganda and of the Royal Seminary, maintained the obligation in the *Missa Quotidiana* of reciting the prayer *Fidelium*, &c., *ultimo loco* :—'Pro oratione vero assignata primo loco not potest alia subrogari.' 'Institutiones Liturgicæ quas digessit Joannes Fornici, Ab Apostolicis Cæremoniis Magister, S. Congr. Cærem. A. Secretis, et in Romano Seminario S. Liturgicæ Professor.' Here is the case, as given in the official printed transactions of the Roman Academia Liturgica :—

"'Die 23 Junii, 1858, para 6½ a meridie. In quodam ecclesiasticorum coetu haud levis agitur quaestio circa qualitatem

primae orationis in missis defunctorum quotidianis recitandae. Nonnulli enim semper orationem *Deus qui inter apostolicos sacerdotes, etc.*, dicendum esse contendunt, alii vero ei pro quo applicatur conveniunt. Cumque disceptatio diutius protrahatur Pablinus prostrator, tardio et doctus, nihili haec sua interesse protestatur — quod, prout olim secundum Novembris, nunquam toto anni decursu missam *de requiem* celebrare soleat. Rubricae namque, ait ipse aperte docent missas votivas non esse nisi rationabili de causa celebrandas, et quoad fieri potest missam cum officio concordare debere.

Quaeritur:—1. An prioribus Ecclesiae seculis in usu foret peculiaris ac propria missa pro defunctis.

“2. Num rubrica citata in casu de missis votivis, comprehendat etiam missas *de requiem*?

“3. Quid de Pablini generali ratione, prout in casu judicandum?

“4. Quid statuumdum quoad primam orationem in missis defunctorum quotidianis?”

“N. MURPHY, P.P.

## Documents.

### CASE OF DOUBT AS TO A CONSECRATED ALTAR.

#### S. RITUUM CONGREGATIO.

##### I.

##### IMOLEN.

Reverendus Dominus Alsius Tutori Episcopus Imolensis, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequens Dilectum pro opportuna solutione humillime subicit, nuntiavit: In Ecclesia Cathedrali civitatis Imolensis adesse altare marmoreum, quod tamquam fixum habetur, maxime ex eo quod in inscriptione eius parvo insculpta legatur haec verba: “Carol. Antonius Ruspantius Episcopus Imolensis aedificavit et consecravit hoc altare.”

Verum de eius valide consecratione subortum est dubium ex eo quod, licet mense constet ex lapide; huius tamen in suis extremitatibus adhaere quaedam vestigia et coniectura fuit tante vel post consecrationem ignominiae curam ex hoc habere: quo fit ut mensa non sit recte ex omni lapide, ut praescriptum est pro altaribus fixis. Cui dubio vis necesse estimo ex responsione Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis sub die 29 Augusti 1885 in



Eugubina. Hinc quaeritur : debet ne hoc altare haberi tamquam fixum et consecratum ; et quatenus negative, potest ne haberi tamquam altare portatile ?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, re mature perpensa, ita proposito Dubio rescribendum censuit, videlicet : *Sanato quovis defectu, Altare fixum consecratum haberi debet.* Atque ita rescripsit die 23 Aprilis 1893.

✠ CAL. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*  
VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *Secretarius.*

---

# VESTMENTS OF THE SACRED MINISTERS AT BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT WHICH FOLLOWS COMPLINE IMMEDIATELY.

## II.

### SENAGALLIEN.

De mandato sui Rñi Episcopi, hodiernus Caeremoniarum Magister in Cathedrali Ecclesia Senagalliensi, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia pro opportuna solutione humillime subiecit, nimirum :

*Dub. I.* Quotiescumque expleto Completorio, sollemnis benedictio cum SSño Eucharistiae Sacramento adstantibus christi-fidelibus in Ecclesia Cathedrali impertitur, sacri Ministri pro Dalmatica et Tunicella supra Albam, possunt ne supra rochetum vel superpellicem tantum induere Pluviale ? Canonicus vero celebrans potestne adhibere tantum Amictum, Stolum et Pluviale, Alba omisa ?

*Dub. II.* In eiusmodi Benedictione quae immediate datur post Completorium, sacri Ministri indui ne possunt iisdem cuiusvis coloris paramentis, quibus antea usi sunt ad Vesperas ?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, re mature perpensa, ita propositis Dubiis rescribendum censuit, videlicet :

Ad I. Sacri Ministri in casu induantur Dalmatica et Tunicella, et Sacerdos celebrans Albam deferat sub Pluviali.

Ad II. Utendum paramentis nonnisi coloris albi. Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit die 12 Maii 1893.

✠ CAL. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*  
VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *Secretarius.*

III.

His addendum est aliud quaesitum, ab eodem Caeremoniarium Magistro S. R. Congregationi propositum, nimirum: An tolerari possit quod Canonicus post pontificalem benedictionem indulgentias publicans, ad nomen Episcopi titulum Comitis adiungat; quamquam ex liturgicis legibus absolute Comitis prohibitum sit quocumque modo immutare formulas Caeremonialis Episcoporum ac Pontificalis Romani?

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, suprascripto Dubio rescribendum censuit: *Negative*. Die 12 Maii 1893.

✠ CAI. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*  
VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *Secretarius*.

---

Notices of Books.

---

THE CEREMONIES OF ORDINATION, WITH THE CEREMONIES OF THE MASSES, PRIVATE AND SOLEMN, IN WHICH ORDERS ARE CONFERRED. By Rev. Patrick O'Leary, Dean, Maynooth College. Dublin: Browne & Nolan.

THIS is an admirable book, and one much needed. "We have been assured," writes the author in the preface, "by ecclesiastics in authority, that some such book as ours is very much wanted." We beg to offer our assurance to the same effect. It is a trite, though oftentimes untrue, statement that a book supplies a long-felt want; but in this case it is quite as true as trite. How pressing the want is every priest must have felt when preparing to receive Orders. He felt that he was about, for the first and last time, to take a principal part in a very important and very solemn ceremony; he had no book to inform him what he was expected to do, or how he was to comport himself at the various parts of the ceremony; the oral instructions he received were too brief and concise; and so he found himself on the morning on which he was to receive Orders anxious, excited, and confused. The result, in most cases, was what might be expected from one in such a state of mind. This difficulty can no longer exist, for undoubtedly the want so long and so pressingly felt has been admirably met by the handsome little volume now before us.

Father O'Leary's experience of the general ordinations in Maynooth College, together with the duty which devolves on him

of lecturing to the senior students on the ceremonies peculiar to episcopal functions, has long since constituted him the very highest authority on the matters dealt with in this book. Martinucci's celebrated work is followed in the main; but our author does not hesitate to differ from him on many points. In such cases he can always claim the support of rubricists hardly less distinguished than Martinucci himself. Among these he relies chiefly on Bourbon, Vavasseur, and De Herdt.

The book contains everything that is necessary to be known about the ceremonies of ordination. Beginning with tonsure, the author goes through in detail the ceremonies for conferring each of the orders in a Low Mass and in a High Mass respectively; and, with regard to tonsure and the minor orders, the ceremonies for conferring them *extra Missam*. He also deals separately with the ordination of one and of many, with an ordination on Holy Saturday, and with ordination in a High Mass celebrated by the Ordinary, and by a bishop who is not the Ordinary.

The book will prove valuable to others besides students preparing for ordination and priests who have to assist at ordinations; for the author adds valuable chapters on some of the more usual episcopal functions unconnected with ordinations.

For example, he explains fully the ceremonies of Solemn Mass celebrated by a bishop in his own diocese, distinguishing between the case when Mass is celebrated in the cathedral and that in which it is celebrated in some other church, and also pointing out the difference in the ceremonies arising from the presence or absence of the Chapter.

We have seldom seen a book which deals so clearly, tersely, and satisfactorily with a complex and difficult subject as the present one does. Of all the ceremonies, the episcopal ceremonies are decidedly the most complex and confusing. Yet in this book they are explained so methodically and luminously that one comes to regard them as quite simple. It did not enter into the scope of the author to explain the general rubrics regarding ordinations; still he gives a few very valuable notes on them. Among the subjects touched on in these notes we find the age for candidates for the different orders, the interstices, *litterae testimoniales*, *litterae dimissoriae*, dispensation from irregularities, the *titulum missionis*, &c., &c. We heartily welcome the book, and venture to predict for it a very wide circulation.

D. O'L.

THE VATICAN AND THE KINGDOM OF ITALY. By the Very Rev. L. Maglione, Canon of the Diocese of Salford. Sold by Messrs. Burns & Oates, London

THE object of the present work, as its author tells us, is to bring "to the knowledge of the public, the cruel conspiracy, the intrigues, and brute force," by which the so-called *unity* of Italy was effected, and the temporal power of the Pope demolished. The pages before us are the outcome of a controversy with the cavalier Froehlich, in which, as usual, the side of falsehood was apparently victorious, owing to having the last word and immense boldness. "We feel no concern about the future of the Roman Pontiff, however," says the worthy Canon, "whether his enemies are sovereigns, like the degenerate Princes of Savoy; or philosophers, like the sub-alpine philosopher, Vincent Gioberti; or heretics, like Luther and Calvin; or poets, like Voltaire and Beranger; or socialists, like Mazzini and Proudhon; or politicians, like Cavour and Bismarck: thus we cannot be much concerned about cavalier Froehlich's letters. If the temporal power were not a great institution, if it were not necessary to the independent exercise of the Pope's sacred functions, it would not be decried, calumniated, and fiercely attacked. This, however, does not free us from the duty of standing up in defence of truth and justice. And it is through a sense of this duty that I wish to expose the base falsehoods and criminal intrigues of the Sardinian Government. "My only desire," he says, in concluding his preface, "is to publish facts in proof of my statement, that the subversion of the temporal power of the Pope is an act of spoliation, a fraud, and a sacrilege perpetrated, not by the will of the Italian people, but by intrigues and armed conspiracy fomented by the House of Savoy, backed by ambitious politicians, and interested adventurers."

And the good Canon is well fitted to perform the task of unmasking the ugly features of the Italian revolution. He, himself, took a prominent part, at the head of his people, in resisting the introduction of either Mazzini or Victor Emmanuel into Naples; and, when, in spite of the heroism and self-sacrifice of his countrymen, the minions of the north had, by bribery and treachery, succeeded in effecting an entrance into his beloved city—"the queen of the sea"—he was seized, imprisoned, and sentenced to a heavy fine, and to twelve years' penal servitude. Thanks, however, to his prompt resolution and courage—characteristics which have distinguished



the author through life—he was able to escape in a small fishing-boat from Naples to Cività Vecchia, and thence, after being imprisoned by the Papal gendarmes, on to Rome. The English mission has gained by Naples's loss; for twenty-five years Canon Maglione has worked as a zealous missionary in England, yet with many a longing glance, no doubt, towards his native land, from which he was exiled by a foreign invasion. We may well hail an account of the Italian revolution from such a man; and after this first taste the readers of the *I. E. RECORD*, to whom we earnestly recommend the Canon's work, will, we are sure, cry for more from the same source, and of the same quality.

In the first chapter, the author treats of the origin of the temporal power. He shows that the Roman State was not established by the Romans; that without the Popes the city of Rome itself would have ceased to exist; that the Papacy saved from the barbarians, and built on the ruins of the old empire of the Caesars a new sovereignty, which was to be the corner-stone of the whole fabric of European society; that, in short, the temporal sovereignty of the Popes was constituted, first by the Providential direction of circumstances, and next by the wise policy of Christendom at large, as the source and centre of unity and stability, social as well as political. "Catholicism is the founder of the Roman State, and Catholicism has been and will be its preserver."

This thesis is developed, proved, and illustrated in Chapter II., on "The Exercise of the Temporal Power of the Popes." The emperors, after the conversion of Constantine, instinctively felt that their throne could no longer remain in the city where stood the throne of the Vicar of Christ; even the Vandals, Heruli, Goths, and Lombards, never dared to establish in Rome the seat of their government. Thus in the very earliest ages, the Popes, by the necessity of their position, had the temporal sovereignty of the Eternal City imposed upon them. Nobly did they fulfil their office of guardians of their people, and defenders of the city; and the readers of the Canon's pages must exclaim that Rome, but for the Papacy, would be, even as Babylon, or Nineveh, or Troy, a heap of buried ruins, glorious only in memory. "Let Englishmen search out this matter in the pages of history. Let them extend their careful and unbiassed investigations as far back as they choose; they will not fail to meet face to face with this primitive, disinterested, and beneficent power of the Pope. They

will see it gradually assuming more extensive proportions; and finally, without intrigues, without bloodshed, without usurpation, and—which I regard as a most wonderful stroke of Providence—without any diplomatic treaty; exalted into an independent principality by the universal homage of Christendom. Constantine the Great, Theodosius, Pepin, Charlemagne, Otho, the Countess Matilda, became, in the hands of God, the glorious instruments for laying the foundation of the independent sovereignty of the Pope.”

It was against a monarchy thus venerable and thus consecrated that Camillo Cavour entered on his system of lying, intrigue, and violence. The plan of attack was arranged by that wily statesman, as early as 1852, with the leaders of the anti-popery party in London, and of the anti-clericals in Paris. “The democratic sects were to be organized, and, whilst publicly denounced secretly encouraged, assisted, rewarded, and salaried.” Giorbert disclosed the real object of the *Rinnovamento* in these remarkable words:—“Christian Rome must be made to return to its first principles, the net, the prison, the scaffold, and the wild beast.” Pallavicino showed the means by which the aims of his master, Cavour, were to be attained:—“Money, the Press, the aid of secret societies, and, when the opportunity arises, by inciting to revolt. All means are good, if they tend to realize the sacred object of our independence!” Napoleon III., Palmerston, and Cavour, formed a zealous triumvirate, and were leagued together to overthrow the Papal power. “This diplomatic and royal revolution was even more formidable than the democratic revolution,” writes Canon Maglione, “for it was more crafty, and more powerfully equipped, more unscrupulous in design, and more wary and prudent in action.”

“It is impossible to mention all the base measures and the unblushing lies of the revolutionists, to corrupt the people of Italy, and induce them to abandon their allegiance to the Holy See. The whole story of the making of Italy is full of the most shameful details that can be read in the annals of any people. The cold-blooded way in which the invasion of the south was planned, without the least reference to the wishes of the Italians themselves, cannot fail to fill any honest mind with utter disgust, especially when he reflects that the hypocrisy of Piedmont has attempted to make the present situation rest on the spontaneous (?) plebiscites of the southern inhabitants of Italy. For the rest of the sad history—with its pictures of bloodshed, plunder, and

sacrilege, its intrigues and lying infringements of laws, national and international, human and divine—the reader should consult the pages of our author. From what is there written it is easy to perceive that “the Piedmontese Government aimed its cruel blows not only at the temporal power of the Pope, but at the spiritual life of the Church. And it is this Government which would have us believe that they went to Rome to protect the Pope and religion; this is the Government which proclaims the law of “Guarantees”!

The author's conclusion is, that, in spite of all efforts “to rear the throne of a fearfully debased dynasty,” in the room of the chair of St. Peter, the cause of the Church's independence, and of the liberty of the Holy See is victorious; the noble protests and attitude of Pius IX. and of Leo XIII. have won the day, backed “by the universal, constant, firm, and loyal demonstrations of his children throughout the world.” Still there is much to be done; the final triumph has not yet come, and it remains for us, as Catholics, “to protect and agitate with unflagging energy within the limits of the constitution of our country. Our protest must be, as in the past, explicit, uncompromising, vigorous, and enthusiastic.” We must remember that “the usurpation of the temporal power can never establish an accomplished fact. . . . No, we shall not rest, and we shall give no rest to those who have to deal with us in political matters, till the temporal power be restored to the Pope; convinced, as we are, that the Pope must be independent of all external power, and especially that of the State in which he resides. This independence has become, for the Papacy, a necessity. The Church is universal, it is a great international or supernational institution, raised above the passions of parties, the wars of states, and the jealousies of nations. The security of the country, and of the city, whence the Sovereign Pontiff was to watch over the preservation and interests of the Church in all other countries, was a condition indispensably required for discharging the duties of so exalted a position.”

A. H.

HISTORY OF THE IRISH NATIONAL PILGRIMAGE TO ROME;  
OR, NOTES ON THE WAY. By the Rev. J. Nolan.  
Dublin: M. H. Gill. Belfast: M. M'Corry. Glasgow:  
Cameron & Ferguson.

THE year 1300 is remembered in the history of the Church as the year of the great jubilee. The year 1893 is sure to be

remembered in Irish ecclesiastical history as the year of the pilgrimage. It was long before since a body of Irish Catholics, both clerical and lay, had assembled in the Holy City to assure the Pope of their devotion to the Church—so long, indeed, that the happy thought which occurred to his Eminence Cardinal Logue of calling on the children of St. Patrick to show this outward mark of their attachment to the Holy See and its present illustrious occupant, gave rise to doubts in the minds of many as to the feasibility of organizing a thoroughly successful pilgrimage in the winter season. That all such doubts and fears were quite groundless, this handsome volume amply testifies. In it Father Nolan gives a glowing account of the pilgrimage, of its formation, its progress, its success. Everything that organizing and reception committees could do to facilitate the progress of the pilgrims was ably done, and done in time. The journey itself was full of interest. From London to Milan by Brussels, Basle, Lucerne, the St. Gothard, Bellinzona, and Como; then some of the most interesting cities and towns of Italy—Ancona, Loretto, Assisi, Florence, Pisa, Genoa. On their return journey, Avignon, Lyons, and Paris were taken in. The objects of greatest interest in these different places, and in the country around them, are described by the author in a series of vivid sketches, which give proof, not only of good literary power and taste, but also of a wide acquaintance with art, history, and literature. But naturally the centre of all attraction to the pilgrims was Rome and its venerable and illustrious Pontiff. The scenes of the Jubilee celebration are well described, and the ceremonies in which the new Irish cardinal took so prominent a part are fully explained. A full list of the pilgrims is given at the end of the work, and about thirty illustrations bring before the reader the chief monuments and places that were visited. It is altogether a most interesting book, full of devoted loyalty to the Holy See, well written, well brought out, and abounding in the most varied information. Everyone who took part in the pilgrimage is sure to procure a copy of it; but it will be found interesting and useful to many who could only join in spirit in that great act of devotion and attachment to the Successor of St. Peter.

J. F. H.

MANUALE DE INDULGENTIIS. Auctore Benedicta Melata.  
Romae ex Typographia A. Befani. 1892.

IN the whole course of theological science there is no subject demanding such close observation as that of indulgences. Year



after year, and month after month, new indulgences are granted, and new conditions are required for the gaining of long-established indulgences. Hence the priest who wishes to keep himself and his people *au courant* with all the indulgences, and with all the conditions necessary for gaining indulgences, both new and old, must consult either the official documents as they are issued, or else some reliable work giving a summary of these documents. Copies of the documents themselves are difficult to find, and even when found are not always intelligible to those who have not made a special study of the subject. For this reason summaries and commentaries are necessary. An expert's knowledge is often necessary for the clear understanding of some, at least, of the documents issued by the Congregation of Indulgences. An expert undoubtedly the author of the present volume is. He gives us, in the short space of about three hundred and sixty pages, a perfectly clear, full, and accurate treatise on indulgences. The author has gone to the most reliable sources for his information, and he has not confined himself to a few sources, nor to merely modern sources. The mere enumeration of the works consulted extends over seven closely-printed pages. And among them are to be found the works of all the distinguished theologians and canonists, from Lainez Jacobi, who died in 1565, to Beringer, the French translation of whose work, approved by the Congregation of Indulgences, was published in 1890. It will be gratifying to the readers of the I. E. RECORD, as it must be encouraging to its editor, to find that this book, written in Rome and published in Rome, quotes the I. E. RECORD as an authority on indulgences. We welcome the book as a useful addition to our theological library; and we recommend it to every priest who wishes to be "up to date" on the ever-changing subject of indulgences. In his preface the author tells us that his motive in writing the book was devotion to the souls in Purgatory. He believes, and rightly believes, that many indulgences are lost to those poor suffering souls because the conditions are not exactly fulfilled, or because people are not aware of the indulgences that can be gained for them. The purpose, then, of this book is to explain exactly the conditions for gaining indulgences, and to catalogue the indulgences that may be gained, and especially those that are applicable to the souls in Purgatory. For the sake of these suffering souls, as well as for its own intrinsic worth, we cordially wish this book success.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

AUGUST, 1893.

---

## THE CHURCH ABROAD.

### THE AUSTRALIAN MISSIONARY.

IT is only by mixing among strange people, by reflection and comparison, the Irish priest becomes aware of the wondrous gifts with which God has endowed our race for the accomplishment of its evident mission. The native qualities of the Gael are eminently suited to create and strengthen influence, to make him an instrument of powerful efficiency as a missionary and propagandist. His transparent sincerity, simple candour, warmth of soul, generous enthusiasm, and, above all, his sublime unquestioning faith form a refreshing contrast to the artificial hollowness, cautious reserve, cold, sickly platitudes, and narrow selfishness, that rule the hour. His presence in society diffuses around an atmosphere of healthy freshness that is as the mild fragrance of spring meadows compared to the dignified oppressiveness of the perfumed *salon*. By the very decadence of faith, the world, too, is preparing itself to give our mission effect. From the ever-sinking plain on which it stands, non-Catholic society admires, and sighs for what is daily growing beyond its reach. The cultured priest, retaining every particle of raciness in his Irish nature, by the natural endowment of his forte, can sway hearts as he will. Unconsciously human souls are opened to him where zeal and caution blended can embed the sacred seeds of faith, trend, colour, or, at least, utilize a vast amount of humanity,

to such an extent that, having for years carefully observed the forces of our Irish nature playing on their surroundings, the writer is fully convinced, that did we properly persuade and arouse ourselves to the powers that in us lie, after the grace of God, in the chosen hands of this small island's children is the moulding and regenerating of the wide, wide world. That all these endowments may be utilized to the fullest, and the thorough success of this apostolic crusade may be assured, one thing is absolutely essential—*a training specially suited to the field of the priest's future action.*

It seems like repeating a self-evident truth to say that the preparation required for the unruffled placidity of sweet Irish life would prove inadequate for lands where fervid activity of thought and action glows, and the busy hum of intense energy is heard on every side; where currents and counter-currents are for ever clashing; where hard blows must be given and warded; where, in a word, the Church knows no repose, but is in every sense a Church-militant. The ever-varying tactics and weapons of our enemies, too, demand a corresponding preparedness. The training of fifty years ago would have as much chance of successfully combating the hostile forces of to-day as the regiments of the same period, with their powdered queues and flint-locks, could attempt to cope with a modern army of Enfield rifles and repeating field-guns. Yet, instead of being ever present to the student's mind, these considerations seldom influenced our preparation to any appreciable extent. With what result? That the first feeling of a young priest suddenly transplanted and cast into the fierce whirl of modern life is often one of stupor and amazement at his own unpreparedness for the exigencies of new and strange positions, at how little he knows, and how much he has yet to learn; his incompleteness and inadequacy of preparation for his new surroundings; the feeling of a quick demand on his private energies to supply deficiencies a neglected past leaves him now to lament. It would be unjust to underrate the difficulty of training for purely abstract contingencies, and for life lying long leagues away; yet it is not insuperable.

Having in my last article sketched the life and civilization

amongst which the future missionary's lot is destined to be cast, I may be permitted in this final paper to emphasize a few of the leading subjects to which, with great profit to his future career, he could pay particular attention during his preparatory course.

#### PHILOSOPHY AND DOGMA.

The Church has been called on to withstand heresies from her cradle. Enemies have raged around her footsteps from the day of Pentecost to this hour; hence after nineteen centuries few points of her doctrine remain unassailed, and the world has little left to hear in the way of fresh objection; but the pith of scholastic difficulties, venerable by centuries, are daily hammered into novel shapes and decked in new disguises.

The ablest efforts of the freethought lecture-hall principally consist of a patchwork of exhumed sophistries and objections. The ghosts of Eutiches and Nestorius still stalk the stage, and Manes and Arius might readily recognise their systems often but scantily disguised in the tawdry rags of modernism. Since the paganism of our day is constantly forced to dig for the rusty buried weapons with which their fathers and allies fought, it may prove an incentive spur to the student's energy to remember that when he triumphantly refutes objections in his metaphysic or dogmatic class, it is not dead Kants or forgotten Arians he is demolishing, not combating errors long since passed away, which nobody thinks of reviving, but actually wrestling with living realities, smashing what truly forms the kernel of a large proportion of the so-called philosophy of our own day. The outward shapes and dressing may be remodelled, but this is only to render their substantial force more effective. Let him by no means dream that these errors are defunct; they have changed and are new shaped, to be sure, but dead they are not; and what boots it to a soldier of to-day to reflect that the rapier or scimeter is no more when its steel is but more finely tempered and fashioned into the slashing efficiency of the modern sabre? The study of philosophy in our days has ceased to be a field for the mere indulgence of a mind of



strong speculative proclivities, or a mental gymnasium in which to develop the reflective and concentrative faculties preparatory to theology. Agnostic tactics have pressed this science into an efficient arm of its service; consequently we must not only meet them on their own ground, but carefully study both the shape and substance of their weapons. This leads to an important consideration. Would it not be well if the student's mind could be trained in Catholic philosophy, unencumbered by the leaden formulæ of another age, made familiar with the objections current in recent philosophic literature, and the mode of expression popular in our time? It would greatly facilitate his efforts, and endow him with new strength when he goes out from his College to grapple face to face with the infidel world, if he were trained to apply familiarly the genuine old scholastic principles to the solution of questions which occupy the attention of contemporary thinkers. Few, even if they possessed the ability, have the time or patience to bind and fit approved principles to the solving of pressing concrete problems; but that they might prove of practical utility, they should be recast, remodelled in their application, and set as it were to the time and tone of the nineteenth century.

“ Shall [asks my former president] Catholic teaching be confined exclusively to scholastic philosophy in its ancient forms, or shall professors of philosophy in Catholic Colleges be required to expand and develop the principles of St. Thomas to the wants of modern philosophic discussion? shall we ignore the living present and errors which are in active operation, and are eating into the very vitals of Christian faith and Christian moral teaching?”<sup>1</sup>

Certainly not, it was not thus the great masters of Christian philosophy acted in the past. They did not waste ammunition, or point the guns on the phantoms of dead centuries, but levelled their truest aim and pointed bullets on the active evil forces of their own day.

Catholic France and Italy have for a whole century been fighting the Church's battle over the very ground on which the active-service regiments of the Irish apostolic army are

<sup>1</sup> *The Study of Mental Philosophy by Catholic Students*, by the Very Rev. James B. Kavanaugh, D.D.

just now entering. During that time there have been few points of the Church that did not suffer attack and demand sterling defence. Some of the ablest intellects the Continent produced have been ranged under the Christian standard; enriched and supplied her arsenal with defensive armour; created a controversial and combative literature, which, if made available by popular English translations, would prove of supreme value. There are, I am certain, a number of scholarly Irish priests fully competent did they only undertake the task, and at the white throne of God alone could they know what apostolic service they would have rendered. A hard-worked American missionary produced a little book<sup>1</sup> that has achieved a popularity perhaps unexampled for its size. The avidity with which its thousand copies continue to be bought up simply indicate the great necessity that exists for similar literature. A hope for the building up of an ecclesiastical literature suitable to our own wants, is out of the question for long years to come, considering the infant state of the Australian Church. The raising of the material structure for the present, at least, absorbs all our energies. Brains edging the ring of the trowel and hammer, or racked by the very practical problem, how to clear a church debt off, have little thought tissue left spare to ponder or evolve.

#### CHURCH HISTORY.

Not only will the history of the Church prove an invaluable mine from which to draw material for sermons, but for illustrating the glory of her past, every page of which unfolds a new phase of her beauty and a convincing proof of her supernatural life. The story of her triumphs over determined forces, her victorious march over the powerful hosts that flung themselves upon her path, her marvellous recuperative and regenerative power just at the moment when she seemed crushed, the wonderful progressive energy with which she daily conquers new fields and wrests the very weapons from the hands of hostile opposition with which to carve out new paths of glory—all this is eminently

<sup>1</sup> *Notes on Anglicanism*, by Father Lambert.

calculated to nerve the arms of her struggling children. In the toil of contest, when the fight is pressing hard, some hearts will incline to despond, but pictures of brilliant past pours in the freshening wine of hope. It is at the hour of trial that armies are reminded of their victorious achievements, and "Soldiers, behold the sun of Austerlitz!" strikes a key-note in human nature no skilful general can afford to despise. As a defensive weapon Church history is indispensable. To turn people's eyes away from their own blank want of positive teaching, and afford an apology for their sects' existence, Protestant—especially dissenting ministers—are forced to make calumny their stock-in-trade, and are for ever raking up supposed black spots in our past annals. As instances of the Church's jealous enmity towards science, and her cruel intolerant bigotry, the case of Galileo, the Spanish Inquisition, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, are exhibited constantly to inspire terror and a warning.

Men may be met with, of scarcely any education, and little or no knowledge of their own religion, who are well primed in such current historical objections. This mode of procedure has achieved no small success. People shudder at the mention of the Inquisition or Smithfield, and Protestants when going on the Continent are sure to make a pilgrimage of reverence to the old rusty sanctuary lamp still suspended before the high altar of Pisa, where they sigh relief, and thank God that the chains of Rome can no longer bind the human intellect, or the voice of ignorant authority stifle scientific investigation. Hence, not only for himself, but by means of lectures and sermons, to arm his people against misrepresentation, a fair knowledge of Church history is absolutely indispensable to the young missionary.

The frequent recurrence of the word "infidel" in these papers requires an explanation. Fifty years must pass over the Established Church in England before it can have reached the state of disintegration it presents at the antipodes to-day. The props of crown, aristocracy, respectability, centuries of tradition no longer uphold it here. Deprived of these human supports, the complete absence of supernatural vitality immediately appears, and then a

crumbling to pieces takes place. The corpse but required exposure to the free penetrating atmosphere for decomposition. The line of Protestant declension is just what might be expected—a rapid sweep from High Church Ritualism to frank avowed agnostic infidelity—a revived paganism. I shall let the luminous pen of a recent non-Catholic writer<sup>1</sup> paint this evolution and helpless wreckage in England, and allow the reader's imagination to picture its fuller pagan development in the colonies:—

“We are at last beginning to see in it [Protestant Christianity] neither the purifier of a corrupted revelation nor the corrupter of a pure revelation, but the practical denier of all revelation whatsoever. It is fast evaporating into a mere natural theism . . . the supernatural element is disappearing, and the natural element becoming nebulous . . . Protestantism is at last becoming explicitly what it always was implicitly, not a supernatural religion which fulfils the natural, but a natural religion which denies the supernatural . . . It merely reflects and focalizes the uncertainty that men are again feeling—the uncertainty and sad bewilderment. The words and countenance once so sure and steadfast now change, as we look at and listen to them, into new accents and aspects; and the more earnestly we gauge and listen, the less can we distinguish clearly what we hear and see. ‘*What shall we do to be saved?*’ men are again crying. And the lips that were once oracular now merely seem to murmur back confusedly, ‘*Alas! what shall you do?*’ Such and so helpless even now is natural theism showing itself; and in the dim and momentous changes that are coming over things, in the vast flux of opinion that is preparing, in the earthquake that is rocking the moral ground under us, overturning and engulfing former landmarks, and reopening the graves of the buried lusts of paganism, it will show itself very soon more helpless still. Its feet are on the earth only. The earth trembles, and it trembles; it is in the same case as we are. It stretches in vain its imploring hands to heaven. But the heaven takes no heed of it. No divine hand reaches down to it to uphold and guide it.”

#### CULTURE.

In a man whose profession presupposes a gentleman, external graces, such as dignity of deportment, carriage, and bearing, should not be forgotten. A loutish walk and sprawling gait detract much from what a priest should be. The

<sup>1</sup> *Is Life Worth Living?* by W. H. Mallock.



exercises of drill and calisthenics would contribute much to give erectness of bearing, graceful ease, and control over the movements of the body: in a word, that dignified carriage which should characterise a *reverend* man. These may be trifles, yet they are the precise trifles that combine to make perfection. Inharmonies, even in small parts, destroy unity of whole: a graceless, drawling carriage mars that impressive and noble dignity that should characterise the priest. Single-minded zeal, enthusiastic devotion to duty, while they must extort a just meed of praise, can never cover other deficiencies. The world will insist on measuring with its own rule and measure. To impress our influence on it we must take up the glove, and challenge its respect on its own chosen ground. Proud and polished society of the day will reluctantly yield itself to the influence and guidance of a man whose culture is even perceptibly deficient, though he should possess the massive solidity of St. Thomas combined with the seraphic zeal of Assisium. If a priest be not a gentleman, in polished society's sense of the term, his influence as a priest is seriously handicapped. If the young native cannot respect him as the latter, his sacerdotal authority will sit lightly on the youth of this land. It is utterly impossible for Catholics reared in a purely secular atmosphere to look at matters and judge them from the same true standpoint as those accustomed from infancy to Catholic surroundings and ideas. The best cannot help having his views tinged and his judgment biased by the manners and social life in which he lives and moves. The beautiful Irish vision, purified and illumined by his rich surroundings of faith, that sees but the minister of God alone, and forgets the man with his shortcomings, cannot be expected here. It is true the Australian canon of judgment is not the correct one, but we must deal with facts as we find them, and not as we would wish them to be. There is, however, one apology. The Protestant and infidel is only too glad to pounce on the pastor's deficiencies with which to jeer and humiliate his flock. Our people proudly boast of their priests, and often form comparisons far from flattering to their non-Catholic friends. It is small wonder if these

same friends gladly avail themselves of even the smallest weapon with which to return the thrust. While they are inexorable on this point, no people more willingly show their respect, or more generously yield their admiration for the priest who is up to the requirements of his age and adopted country, and who labours with single-hearted earnestness. Both they must have; for while they entertain just contempt for a mere fop, the keen sensitiveness of their inborn pride is far too delicate not to writhe and quiver under the sneer of infidel or Protestant when directed at their pastor's awkward manners, graceless gesture, or slender acquaintance with the English language and its proper pronunciation.

#### ENGLISH AND ELOCUTION.

Without a good acquaintance, were it possible, a masterful grasp and command over the English tongue, ease and force in its delivery, what might be converted into a vast engine for the conversion of souls becomes, in a great measure, a buried gift. The well whose saving waters are thirsted for becomes, in truth, a *fons signata*. Were it possible that in a priest's head should lie the entire profound mass of scholastic theology that glorifies the pages of St. Thomas, combined with all the moral wealth of St. Alphonsus, of what practical use is it, outside the confessional, to a man who has not mastered the one vehicle wherewith to pour it on minds that, amidst the clashings of doubt and the deluge of sceptical materialism, are constantly needing the "corrective light"? The pulpit, in a purely Catholic country, where the Church's teachings and the principles of faith are as well known and undisputed as the location of the parish church, is of secondary importance. In mixed communities the case stands far different; it is essentially an organ of instruction, and the people anxiously look for its light and help. Should this powerful agency be neglected, or used indifferently, the effects on a parish will soon appear.

One of the first objects of wonder in store for a young priest is the extraordinary importance Australians attach to the sermons and the preaching. Few people will go farther to hear a good discourse; few more readily yield themselves

willing captives to the charm of the preacher's graceful art ; but few also will carry away more of what is said, discuss, analyze, and comment upon it.

Conflict with opposing ideas, a constant struggle against error in every shape, excites a hunger and creates a necessity for knowledge. To neglect this powerful auxiliary of the missionary, is a crime of great magnitude, since the divine command, *predicate* and *docete*, could not press more heavily on the foreign mission if an anathema stood behind them.

When we analyze the composition of an ordinary congregation this necessity becomes apparent. (a) There are grown-up persons in whose young years opportunities for instruction were few, and the Church far from being as well provided with schools and convents as it is to-day. The circumstances of such rendered anything but a fragmentary knowledge of their religion impossible. (b) Irishmen whose knowledge, even when they arrived, could scarcely be called vast, have certainly not added to it in the wear and tear of twenty or thirty years on gold-fields and bush-farms, with non-Catholic surroundings and literature. (c) The children of mixed marriages, coming from a social hearth, where, perhaps, in the interests of harmony, the subject of religion was avoided—precisely the very place where its influence should be most potent and earliest felt—children whose young minds and thoughts remained undirected by her whose duty it should have been, from their earliest infancy, to colour the opening fancy, and to give tone and flavour to the young efforts of reason. (d) The rising generation, in general, who are destined to be the fighting army of the future, and cannot be too completely equipped for a world every day losing its Christian colouring ; the many-hued web of Protestantism is falling to shreds, and the light of its pagan origin breaking through it. The old break-water hulk that for a time lay across the stream, and dammed the infidel waves, is fast dissolving ; and the day is near at hand when those same waves, in all their hissing fury, shall roar around the rock immovable. On that day a terrible conflict opens ; even now its breath is strong upon us ; but those

whose duty it will be to defend the faith that is in them cannot be too completely armed.

A short examination of the wealth of forces placed at our disposal will readily show how admirably equipped the Irish missionary may be for the office of preacher. From no desire to disparage others, or indulge national vanity, it can, in all truth, be stated that it is a recognised fact that whatever else the Irish lack, nature has proclaimed them a nation of orators.

The solid reasonings of English minds may afford charming reading, but the gift oratorical, as a nation, they do not possess. The leaden coldness and laboured efforts of the Anglo-Saxon mind make the richest spoken sentences fall like icy pellets on the ear. The spiritualized lava on which conviction rides is absent: then the English accent essentially lacks carrying power or striking force. The want of the strong grasp of the fuller consonants and the ever-expanding softness of the vowel-sounds, which almost melt into each other, cause the sentences to dissolve and die before they reach their goal.

The very qualities which render French the most delightful conversational language on earth constitute its greatest drawback as an oratorical vehicle. Its range and inflexions are limited within narrow compass, and its sounds almost entirely confined to labial and dental tones. The rich, deep, mellow resonance that lends itself to every mood passion: the solemn reverberating majesty: the tender all-sweeping pathos: the passionate storm of high and blazing enthusiasm—all these powers, that speak through a variety of tones, rapidly striking a multitude of varied chords, carrying captive sympathies and reason convinced in their all-embracing sweep, all these are wanting.

Contrast both with Ireland, and her singular advantages instantly appear. The most varied and effective weapon in the rich armoury of Irish eloquence is our native *patois*—the soft flexible lovely music of the Irish brogue—where there is just colouring enough of this to enrich the tone, it gives a quaint freshness and tender simplicity that instantly captivates the ear. The round and liquid vowel-sounds, the



strong articulation of the consonants, especially the fullness of the "th" and the kettle-drum roll of the "r" adds a rich softness and masculine resonance admirably suited to pathos and to reasoning. Those who have heard trained educated Irish speakers using their native dialect, can appreciate its value as an accessory to language. The muffled roll, rising like the sound of distant thunder, in denunciation, and carrying awe upon its breath, the tender plaintiveness melting and subduing, surpass and defy analysis.

Our Celtic origin gives us a clearness of conception and rapidity in reasoning; hence our perspicuity and point in diction: instead of labouring through labyrinths and wearily plodding circuitous roads of logic, Gaelic genius instantly flashes to the centre point. The advantage of this in a speaker is evident. The transparency of his sincerity, the fervid enthusiasm of his convictions, waxes warm, clarifies his reasoning, and shines through his language; it contributes a very soul to his voice, illumines and furnished wings of fire to every idea. But more, electric Hibernian enthusiasm is contagious: his audience catch it; it melts, moves, and holds them unconscious captives to his sway.

(2) Our insular position and Gaelic origin would in any case have endowed our language with idiomatic expression and nervous vigour, but the dead tongue in which our fathers learned to think has intensified the original raciness of our caste of thought. The very startling novelty, indeed grotesqueness of our ideas, cadences, and inflexions, strike strangely, and instantly arouses and rivets attention from the first. Thus without effort, but by the very native mould of his conceptions, and the capturing music of his Irish tongue, the missionary secures the vantage-ground, disarms hostility, and opens clear the road on which the full force of his artillery may play. God has endowed our race with an abundance of wondrous gifts, and pointed a noble mission wherein to use them. If they are properly shaped and polished, by a thorough training in the English language, its composition and elocution, they will prove swords of flame in the young missionaries' hands, and help to place within the grasp of Catholic Ireland an Archimedean lever wherewith

to move and sway the world wide. There are artists reaping golden harvests, not because of their transcendent histrionic excellence, but because they have mastered the secret beauties of Irish life, and with their native dialect sweep the octaved glories of Irish passion, leaving no chord untouched. They mould tones into epics, express storm, pathos, scorn, as no other dialect can. With what result? The world is sick and tired of conventional sins and feeble heroisms, dry, selfish, and narrow hearts, and a formality of friendship that dies with its very expression; this rain of Irish candour, heroic sublimity, pure faith, rich dialect, tender pathos, where the sigh of regret fringes the heart-voice of love, falls on it like the refreshing dews of heaven. Why not gather up all these living forces, combine, shape, and ceaselessly polish them for the service of God's word? If actors for mere gain can sway multitudes, evoke enthusiasm, and produce conviction, how much more powerful will the same instruments prove in the hands of the missionary? Earnestness, unselfishness of purpose, the sublimity of his vocation, all stand behind, and the fructifying power of God's grace seals and glorifies his pleadings. If from the very depths of his soul the writer appeals to students, the scenes of whose future labours will be beyond Irish shores, to spare no energy in acquiring a mastery of the English tongue, elocution and a finished pulpit training; of pressing into its service the marvellous wealth of material which forms the heritage of our race; it is because deficiencies in the past have caused much ground to be lost, and in the vast vistas of the future are lying whitened harvests whose acquisition will soon transform the world's face.

Without going outside the shores of Ireland herself, one striking fact reveals and proves this special apostolic call of our nation. Within the past decade the general population has sadly decreased, and though hope has come and the dawn of a bright future, an increase of material prosperity can scarcely be claimed. Under these circumstances one naturally looks for a proportionate diminution of members in ecclesiastical colleges. What are the facts? Instead of diminution, a large increase all round, some having actually

doubled their numbers. God's sweet breath is blowing high the apostolic wave destined to roll its beneficent influences over society's face. Yearly the island is visibly earning for herself the third and most glorious of her titles—*Insula apostolorum*.

#### RETROSPECT AND ANTICIPATION.

What sight more calculated to inspire thankfulness and hope, or on what stronger grounds can we base the prophecy of a glorious future, than on the history of her brief and active past? Only fifty-eight years have passed since the Australian Church ceased to be attached to the diocese of Mauritius, an island that, even in those days of fast-sailing steamers, can scarcely be reached under sixteen days, and then far more difficult of access than London or Brussels. Precisely sixty years have rolled by since the first vicar landed on Sydney quay. The grave closed over him but four years ago; yet he saw the whole vast Australian continent ministered to by two priests, while not a single religious sister had blessed the land. He saw the infant Church struggling under heavy difficulties; the haughty insolence of Protestant ascendancy overbearing and crushing her; the anti-papal proselytizing magistrate-parson, backed by the whole strength of anti-Irish British officialdom. The harvest was vast, the difficulties immense, and the labourers miserably few. Dr. Ullathorne describes the life of those times:—

“It was a saying in Sydney, when I arrived, that Lady Therry was the first bonnet that had appeared in the Catholic congregation . . . We generally used the police courts for chapels; but at Bathurst I used the ball-room of the Royal Hotel, built over the stables; and at Appin I said Mass in the room of a tavern, where I preached against drunkenness.”<sup>1</sup>

The hand that penned these lines has drawn, in 1888, a picture that affords a cheering and a striking contrast—a contrast so great that perhaps no page in modern history gives greater proof of the supernatural strength and expansive vitality of the Church than those recording her life on

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*.

the Australian continent over the short span of half a century. He says:—

“ I have certainly seen wonderful changes in my day, both in the expansion of the Church in this country and the transmutation of the doctrines of Anglicanism, and cannot but think that these latter will ultimately lead many souls into the Church. But the most remarkable thing I have witnessed is the expansion of the Church in Australia. When I arrived in that country, in 1833, there were but three priests, whilst now there is a cardinal archbishop, four archbishops, twenty-two bishops, and nearly a thousand priests. At the Centenary of the foundation of New South Wales this year, seven governors of provinces, as many prime ministers and chief justices, attended a meeting in our Cathedral at Sydney to promote its completion, and £3,000 were put on the collecting-plates. This shows the position of the Church in Australia.”<sup>1</sup>

Short even as those five years are since this was written, the number of the episcopate has considerably increased, and he might have added that instead of five nuns landing with him in 1839, no less than three thousand and sixteen labour in our schools and hospitals to-day. But the contrast picture is heightened and receives new confirmation from an unexpected quarter. A late English statesman has borne eloquent testimony to the majestic proportions and restless energy of the Australian Church. He augurs brightly for the stability of her future:—

“ Whoever observes the growth—I had almost said the stupendous growth—of that marvellous communion on soil and under conditions which might well at first sight seem ungenial to it, and the solidarity and continuity with which it acts in matters in which it conceives questions of faith are involved, can hardly doubt the power which such an organisation must exert. Believing, as I do, that to the vast proportion of men faith is a moral necessity, and that scepticism is the unfortunate privilege of wealth and limited intelligence, I can only admire the large and statesman-like wisdom with which the Roman Catholic Church has from the first sought to prepare, on an adequate scale, for the future needs of the new world. In every town, indeed, steeples are rising and churches are being built; in the capitals there are cathedrals which, if they cannot rival the splendid edifices of mediæval Europe, yet keep alive in men's

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures of Archbishop Colclough.*



minds some of the leading features of the old faith. All denominations are, with a generous rivalry, engaged in this race. But, whilst acknowledging the efforts which all the different denominations are making in their various fields of labour, any careful observer must be struck by the unwearied and systematic polity of the Roman Catholic Church.”<sup>1</sup>

Surely this is a startling counterpicture to the times when police courts served as cathedrals, when the future Archbishop of Birmingham officiated in the Bathurst ball-room (over the stables) and the Appin tavern, and when in a Sydney congregation Lady Therry's bonnet was an object of sensational novelty. The importance of just now getting every available force at our disposal into the highest burnished perfection, of closing up our ranks in knitted strength and effective preparedness, is evident. The young Australian Church has buckled on her armour, and is learning to stand up in shapely majesty, with forces prepared to give her mission effect. Only now has she become a definitely organized system. Her hierarchy is complete, her priesthood all but sufficient, her sisterhoods legion, her government systematized with regular dignitaries, synods, and councils; her cathedrals built or building; her colleges, schools, societies—in fine, all the accessories—in effective completeness. In her new march of conquest much of the future will depend on the shaped front and solid strength with which she faces the present. How much of all that is dependent on the priest, those who have lived here alone can judge. Hence the training of future missionaries for our sunny land is a grave and a vital question. The young priest does not simply take up the reins that fall from other hands. He does not get an already perfected machinery requiring but little effort to keep up its jog-trot sober motion. He is in every sense a founder and a pioneer. Every blow he strikes leaves a dent. Not only do the building of the material stones and mortar depend on his energy; but, far more, the faith, devotion, and religious intelligence, the spiritual and socio-religious future entirely hang on his

<sup>1</sup> “Australia in 1888,” by the Earl of Carnarvon, in *The Fortnightly Review*, March, 1889.

self-immolation, intellectual force, culture, and the hero beatings of the true missionary heart within.

To the writer the strange thing is that more competent hands did not take up this subject long before. On other shoulders then, not his, the blame must rest—

“ If the lyre so long divine  
Degenerates into hands like mine.”

Yet these efforts if they have achieved nothing more than opening the way for other and abler pens, it is more than reward. Since these papers have begun to appear I have abundant reason to know that a new and lively interest has been awakened in many quarters where it may prove of practical benefit. Let us hope that years will but deepen and intensify the solicitous interest of the venerable mother in the fair young daughter that, rising above the Pacific wave, never averted her face from the old land in the hour of trial, and may never tarnish the traditional glories of the old Church through the ages that are to be.

MICHAEL PHILLAN.

---

## TENNYSON AND ST. THOMAS.

WRITING of St. Thomas of Canterbury and his biographies, the late Professor Freeman made use of the following words<sup>1</sup>:—“ There are few men about the main features of whose history there is so little doubt. Here and there, among the multitude of witnesses, we find unimportant contradictions; here and there we may have our doubts as to the accuracy of a date or the genuineness of a letter; but the main events of his life, from his birth in London to his murder at Canterbury, are known to us as clearly and vividly as the transactions of our own time.” Anyone who has taken the trouble to examine into the number of Lives of the saint that exist by contemporaries of

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, p. 228.

his, and who has looked through the vast number of letters which were either written by him or bear on his life, will find no difficulty in corroborating that statement. Still, strange to say, notwithstanding the abundant materials which exist for estimating the life and character of St. Thomas, there are few great Englishmen whose reputations have passed through so many vicissitudes.

During the period of nearly four centuries that elapsed between the year of his glorious martyrdom and the time of the so-called Reformation, he was honoured as perhaps the greatest of the English saints. Immense multitudes of people, even kings and princes, crowded to his tomb to beg the aid of his intercession; miracles were of frequent occurrence there; and his shrine was constantly being enriched with the most costly presents, so that at the beginning of the sixteenth century it is said to have presented an appearance of the greatest splendour. It is thus described by a Venetian visitor who beheld it about that time:—

“The tomb of St. Thomas the Martyr, Archbishop of Canterbury, exceeds all belief. Notwithstanding its great size, it is all covered with plates of pure gold; yet the gold is scarcely seen, because it is covered with various precious stones, as sapphires, balasses, diamonds, rubies, and emeralds; and wherever the eye turns, something more beautiful than the rest is observed. Nor, in addition to these natural beauties, is the skill of art wanting; for in the midst of the gold are the most beautiful sculptured gems, both small and large, as well as such as are in relief, as agates, onyxes, cornelians, and cameos; and some cameos are of such a size that I am afraid to name it; but everything is far surpassed by a ruby, not larger than a thumb nail, which is fixed at the right of the altar. The church is somewhat dark, and particularly in the spot where the shrine is placed: and when we went to see it, the sun was very near setting, and the weather was cloudy; nevertheless, I saw that ruby as if I had it in my hand. They say it was given by a king of France.”<sup>1</sup>

From the richness of his shrine, some idea may be gained of the honour in which St. Thomas was held by the English people. All was changed when passion hurried Henry VIII. into his quarrel with the Holy See; though up to that time he had yielded to none in honouring the saint, and had, in

<sup>1</sup> A relation of England under Henry VII.

fact, on one occasion, gone on a pilgrimage to his shrine in company with Philip of Austria. After his rupture with Rome, however, fearing that the example of St. Thomas, if the people continued to venerate him, on account of his courage in defending the rights of the Church, might lead men to resist the usurpations of the secular power, he formally cited him to appear in court, to answer the charge of having usurped the office of a saint. When an impious travesty of a trial had been gone through, sentence was solemnly pronounced, to the following effect:—"That Thomas, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, had been guilty of contumacy, treason, and rebellion; that his bones should be publicly burnt, to admonish the living of their duty by the punishment of the dead, and that the offerings made at his shrine should be forfeited to the Crown."<sup>1</sup> In fact, this scandalous sentence was carried out to the letter. The saint's bones were disinterred and burnt, and the ashes scattered to the winds, whilst his name was removed from the Calendar of the English Church.

The saddest part of this unholy farce was the success that attended the policy of the King. The sacredness of Thomas's memory gradually died out of the popular mind; and for centuries the great Primate, the dauntless champion of the Church, was regarded with suspicion and even with positive dislike by the mass of Englishmen. They never thought of consulting the many documents that told of his holy life and martyr's death; of inquiring whether he was deserving of their dislike and aversion: he had been an upholder of Popish doctrines and principles, and that was enough for them. The result was that only within a few Catholic homes up and down the country was the traditional devotion to the saint preserved. There and in the English Colleges abroad the veneration of St. Thomas was preserved down to our own days.

A better state of things, however, began with the present century. The history of St. Thomas has been approached by Anglicans in a scientific spirit; and, if there is still much

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors*, page 95.



to be desired in the conclusions at which they arrive regarding the saint, it cannot be denied that the labours of such men as Giles, Robertson, and Freeman have done much to replace him in the high position which he formerly held in the honour and esteem of Englishmen. Perhaps what will conduce more than anything to make the life of the saint known and appreciated, is the fact that some few years ago six volumes of *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, containing all kinds of authentic records and documents relating to the saint's life, were issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls.

It was, doubtless, the appearance of the *Materials*, and the consequent interest aroused on the subject of St. Thomas, that induced the late Lord Tennyson to write his play, *Becket*, in which he dramatizes the events of the life and martyrdom of the great Archbishop. The play was a good deal spoken of at the time; but it has excited much more interest within the last few months, owing to the fact that it has been brought before the public at the Lyceum Theatre, under the able management of Mr. Irving, assisted by the most distinguished artists of the day. The story of St. Thomas has, therefore, for some time past been before the public, with all the accessories likely to move the imagination and make an impression on the mind. It is important, therefore, that the ideas conveyed to peoples' minds regarding the saint should be correct, and that they should not be imbued with any false notions respecting him.

Lord Tennyson certainly looked upon St. Thomas as a great man; in fact, in the letter dedicating the play to Lord Selborne, the Lord Chancellor of the day, he refers to him as "your great predecessor." Still, it is not as Chancellor that the poet brings St. Thomas before us; it is as Archbishop. True, the first scene represents St. Thomas as Chancellor, with the King. But this scene is in reality, and is called, the prologue; it only introduces us to the play, explaining, among other things, how St. Thomas becomes Archbishop. But as Archbishop, Tennyson undoubtedly draws, on the whole, a very noble picture of the saint. He paints him as a hero,

self-sacrificing, loving the poor, considerate to others, firm in trial, and constant in death. At times, no doubt, he makes him more of the fanatic than the saint; and he puts into his mouth language stronger than perhaps history would warrant. But, then, on the question of language, it must be borne in mind that allowance must be made for times and customs. Stronger language was unquestionably used in the twelfth century than we should employ in these days; and hence we cannot measure the language, even of a saint of past times, when wishing to be severe to men of bad and violent lives, by the standard of taste that prevails among ourselves.

Although, therefore, there are many passages in *Becket*, with which we should find fault, if we wished to criticize the play line by line—to go, so to say, into committee over the play—we do not intend so to deal with it here. There are, however, two points in it to which we take exception, and regarding which we now propose to make a few remarks.

In the first place, Lord Tennyson seems to us to give currency to a false idea regarding St. Thomas; viz., that he maintained a deceitful silence at the time of his appointment to the archbishopric. He does not go so far, it is true, as some non-Catholic writers; but, still, the manner in which he makes St. Thomas to act and speak can have only one meaning. He practically adopts the view of James Anthony Froude on the subject. Mr. Froude contributed to *The Nineteenth Century*, in 1877, three articles on the "Life and Times of Thomas Becket," characterized by all his usual ability and bigotry; and in one of them<sup>1</sup> he writes as follows regarding Becket's acceptance of the primate's see:—

"It is not conceivable [he says] that on a subject of such vast importance, the King should have never taken the trouble to ascertain Becket's views. The condition of the clergy was a pressing and practical perplexity. Becket was his confidential minister, and the one person whose advice he most sought in any difficulty, and on whose judgment he most relied. Becket, in all probability, must have led the King to believe that he agreed with him. There can be no doubt, whatever, that he must have

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, page 561.

allowed the King to form his plans without having advised him against them, and without having cautioned him that from himself there was to be looked for nothing but opposition. The King, in fact, expected no opposition. So far as he had known Becket hitherto, he had known him as a statesman and a man of the world. If Becket had ever in this capacity expressed views unfavourable to the King's intentions, he would not have failed to remind him of it in their subsequent controversy. That he was unable to appeal for such a purpose to the King's recollection, must be taken as a proof that he never did express unfavourable views."

However, according to Mr. Froude, Becket felt some scruples as to his endeavouring to gain the archbishopric under false pretences. Accordingly, he "asked the advice of Cardinal Henry of Pisa. Cardinal Henry told him that it was for the interest of the Church that he should accept the archbishopric, and that he need not communicate convictions which would interfere with his appointment."

The meaning of the above quotation from Mr. Froude requires no elucidation. We are plainly given to understand that St. Thomas, whilst differing entirely from the King in his views regarding the relations that ought to exist between Church and State, led the King to believe that he was in agreement with him on the subject; and so had himself appointed to the primatial see under false pretences.

We find fault with Lord Tennyson for apparently adopting Mr. Froude's view of the case in *Becket*. It is true St. Thomas is represented as making some resistance to his proposed elevation to the see of Canterbury, but it is on the grounds chiefly of his unfitness for such a post, on account of the wordly and military life he had been leading. No real objection is raised by him because of the utter difference of his views from those of the King in matters of Church policy. Thus when Henry first points to Becket as the new primate :—

"*Becket.* Mock me not. I am not even a monk.

Thy jest—no more. Why—look—is this a sleeve  
For an archbishop?

*Henry.* But still the arm within

Is Becket's, who hath beaten down my foes.

*Becket.* A soldier's, not a spiritual arm."

Then, further on, we have the following:—

*Becket.* Then, for thy barren jest,  
Take thou my answer in bare commonplace—  
*No more, my lord.*

*Henry.* Ah, be— *No more.*  
*No more, my good friend,*  
Is quite another matter.

*Becket.* A more awful one.  
Make *me* archbishop! Why, my liege, I know  
Some three or four good priests a thousand times  
Fitter for this grand function. *Me* archbishop!  
God's favour and King's favour might so clash  
That thou and I— --That were a jest, indeed.

*Henry.* Thou angerest me, man; I do not jest."

We find nothing in this dialogue to show that Becket made it clear to the King that, if he were made primate, there were many things in which he might have to defend the rights of the Church against the secular arm. It rather represents the Chancellor as keeping his own counsel. In fact, that he is represented as not being open-minded with the King is made clear by total possibility of doubt from further words which Tennyson puts in his mouth. He has now become archbishop, and is discussing with his confidential friend, Herbert of Besham, the question whether he is really the right man for the primate's see. Amongst other words, he uses the following:—

"And then I asked again, 'O Lord, my God,  
Henry, the King, hath been my friend, my brother,  
And mine uplifter in this world; and chose me  
For this thy great archbishopric, believing  
That I should go against the Church, with him.  
And I shall go against him, with the Church.  
And I have said no word of this to him,  
Am I the man?'"

Does not this passage plainly show that Lord Tennyson represents St. Thomas as circumventing, and knowingly concealing, from the King the difference of his views from those of the King, on the occasion of his election to the archbishopric? And, further, that he so acted knowing that the King believed him friendly in matters in which he was really hostile?



Are there, then, any grounds for the view taken by Mr. Froude on this matter, and apparently adopted by Lord Tennyson? Dean Hook, no friend of St. Thomas, and one who devoted much time and study to investigating the history of his life, thus replies:—"If we place any reliance on history, we must believe that Becket forewarned the King, that, in forcing him upon the chapter of Canterbury, he would lose a servant, if not a friend."<sup>1</sup> He continues, and as it seems to us, with perfect justice:—"There are writers who state that this warning was given with a smile, or with some such inflexion of voice, as would show that the speaker meant one thing while he said another. But these writers only inform us of what they themselves under the circumstances would have done, not what really took place." Indeed, no accusation could be brought forward more unlikely, in regard to St. Thomas, than that he acted in an underhand way, or was guilty of double-dealing. The tendency of his character was all the other way, and he is much more likely to have erred on the side of impetuosity and want of prudence, as is acknowledged by all his biographers. There is no legitimate reason, therefore, for doubting Herbert of Bosham's account of St. Thomas's words to the King when he offered him the archbishopric of Canterbury, or that he did not fully reveal his views to Henry on that occasion.

"What a religious man [he is reported to have said],<sup>2</sup> what a saint you wish to place in that holy bishopric, and over so famous a monastery! I am certain that if, by God's disposal, it were so to happen, the love and favour you now bear towards me would speedily turn into the bitterest hatred. I know that you would require many things, as even now you do require them, in church matters, which I could never bear quietly; and so the envious would take occasion to provoke an endless strife between us."

In these words we have, doubtless, in substance what St. Thomas said to the King. It does not follow, however, that the King took the same view of the matter. It is quite possible that our saint may have opened his mind with

<sup>1</sup> *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ii., page 385.  
<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. xiv., page 4087.

perfect freedom to Henry, and that the latter may still have remained of opinion that his influence and friendship would prevail over St. Thomas's stern sense of duty. The King may well have been deceived by his knowledge of St. Thomas in the past : and may have imagined that by uniting in his person the offices of chancellor and archbishop, by increasing still more the splendour of his position, by bestowing on him the office of regent, during his own frequent and protracted sojourns on the Continent, he would, notwithstanding the saint's protestations to the contrary, succeed in bringing him over to his views. That he was unsuccessful in this, shows, not that St. Thomas had been silent, but that the King had not truly measured the firmness and determination of Becket's character, and that he had over-estimated his own influence with the saint.

In the passage we have quoted from Mr. Froude, he mixes up two things quite distinct in themselves. It by no means follows, because St. Thomas plainly informed the King that, if made archbishop, he might be compelled to quarrel with him on church matters, that he had always been as zealous previously in defending the rights of the Church. It is possible that he may have, on some occasions, gone too far in aiding Henry's policy : and that he had not always been so outspoken, in the days of his chancellorship, as he might have been. All that may be true, and it may be also true, and in fact we confidently affirm that it is true, that when the question of his promotion was spoken of, St. Thomas plainly informed the King that for the future, in such matters, he need not expect any help from him. Mr. Froude, by mixing up these questions together, produces a very plausible paragraph. Of course it is likely that in church matters the King would have consulted his chancellor. But, for that very reason, it is likely that the chancellor, if he were an honest man, and felt that he was having a new office conferred upon him, because his master had derived a false idea of his views, from their consultations together, would have made clear his real sentiments to his patron, before accepting promotion. That is precisely what we assert St. Thomas to have done ; and what history clearly declares him to have done.

There is a second objection we have to bring against Lord Tennyson's *Becket*. We allude to the episode he introduces regarding St. Thomas and Rosamund. We may say at once that we acquit Lord Tennyson of wishing to introduce these scenes in his play as representing any real events in the life of his hero. But still they form a portion of what is for the most part an historical drama; and, on that account, are likely to be considered by the public as founded on fact. No doubt, it is almost impossible to write a popular play in these days, without introducing love-scenes; the romantic element is an essential element in any drama destined to catch the ear of the public. But, for all that, we cannot but regret that St. Thomas's name should have been mixed up with an affair of this kind. There were many ways in which Rosamund might have been brought upon the stage, without introducing her in company with the great archbishop. However, as the episode has been by this time over and over again dramatically represented upon the stage, we think it necessary to show that it has no foundation whatever in history.

First, briefly to summarize the facts of the case, as given in *Becket*. In the opening scene of the play, Henry is represented as married to Eleanor, the divorced wife of Louis of France. During the long dialogue that takes place in that scene, between the King and his chancellor, mention is made of a certain mistress of the King, named Rosamund, whom Henry entrusts to the care of Becket.

*Henry.* Come, I would give her to thy care in England,  
When I am out in Normandy or Anjou.

*Becket.* My Lord, I am your subject, not your—

*Henry.* Pander.

God's eyes ! I know all that—not my purveyor  
Of pleasures, but to save a life—her life ;  
Ay, and the soul of Eleanor from hell fire.  
I have built a secret bower in England, Thomas ;  
A nest in a bush.

*Becket.* And where, my liege ?

*Henry* (*whispers*). Thine ear.

*Becket.* That's lone enough.

*Henry* (laying paper on table). This chart here marked 'her bower,'

Take it, keep it, friend. See, first, a circling wood,  
A hundred pathways running every way,  
And then a brook, a bridge; and after that  
This labyrinthine brickwork, maze in maze,  
And then another wood, and in the midst  
A garden and my Rosamund. Look, this line—  
The rest you see is coloured green—but this  
Draws through the chart to her.

*Becket.* This blood-red line?

*Henry.* Ah! blood, perchance, except thou see to her.

*Becket.* And where is she? There in her English nest?

*Henry.* Would God she were—no, here within the city,  
We take her from her secret bower in Anjou,  
And pass her to her secret bower in England.  
She is ignorant of all but that I love her.

*Becket.* My liege, I pray thee, let me hence; a widow  
And orphan child, whom one of thy wild barons—

*Henry.* Ay, ay, but swear to see to her in England.

*Becket.* Well, well, I swear, but not to please myself.

*Henry.* Whatever come between us?

*Becket.* What should come  
Between us, Henry?

*Henry.* Nay—I know not, Thomas.

*Becket.* What need then? Well—whatever comes between us."

In these words, St. Thomas agrees to accept a very equivocal position towards one in Rosamund's position; a position which, as was only natural, give rise to many insinuations in the course of the play, and caused the Archbishop to be a good deal with Rosamund, and even, on one occasion, to save her life, when attempted by Eleanor, the Queen. Rosamund is represented, on that occasion, as leaving her bower with Becket, and entering Godstow nunnery as a novice. At the time of the martyrdom she is introduced, disguised as a monk, in Canterbury Cathedral; and when the curtain falls, she is seen praying by the Archbishop's body.

There can be no doubt that the rôle assigned to St. Thomas by Tennyson in this portion of the play, however glossed and extenuated, is one quite unworthy of the great Archbishop. No doubt, Rosamund is represented as in danger of her life from the Queen's jealousy; no doubt



also she is supposed to be living in ignorance of the real character of her relations with the King ; but such circumstances could never have justified the Archbishop in assuming the position he is represented as having assumed, and becoming, to some extent, accessory to the guilt of the King. We cannot for a moment allow that such conduct would have been anything but unworthy of St. Thomas.

Are there any grounds, then, for attributing such conduct to St. Thomas ? None whatever. As Professor Freeman says, there are most copious materials for a life of St. Thomas ; not a word is breathed anywhere of any such relation with Rosamund as is here depicted. The Archbishop's life was constantly before the public ; he was always at war ; he lived in the midst of enemies ; still not a syllable of such a scandal as this was ever breathed against him. His life has been written, not only by friends, but by others, as William of Newburgh, who exercised great freedom in criticizing his actions ; but no hint of any such transaction as this has come down to us. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the incident is baseless and without foundation.

If we endeavour to proceed farther, and show, by positive evidence, the impossibility of the facts alleged, the cloud of mystery surrounding the life of Rosamund makes it difficult to arrive at any definite result. Still it would seem that the hard facts of chronology put the romantic story of St. Thomas and Rosamund entirely out of court.

Agnes Strickland, in her *Lives of the Queens of England*, writes<sup>1</sup> as follows regarding Rosamund :—

“ The learned and accurate Carte has not thought it beneath him to examine carefully the testimony that exists concerning Rosamund ; and we find, from him, that we must confine her connection with Henry to the two years succeeding his marriage. He has proved that the birth of her youngest son, and her profession as a nun at Godstow, took place within that space of time, and he has proved it from the irrefragable witness of existing charters, of endowments of land given by the Clifford family to benefit the convent of Godstow ; of provision made by Henry II. for her son, William Long-espée, and his brother, and by the benefactions he bestowed on the nunnery of Godstow because Rosamund had become a votaress therein.”

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i., page 261.

If Agnes Strickland be correct, the story of St. Thomas and Rosamund is clearly fabulous, for Henry was married to Eleanor in 1152, and Becket did not become primate till 1162, when, according to Miss Strickland, Rosamund had been for eight years a nun at Godstow.

The question arises, therefore, how far we can trust Miss Strickland's statements regarding "faire Rosamond." In order to test them, we turn, first, to the passage of the "learned and accurate Carte," upon which Miss Strickland's statement is based. It runs as follows<sup>1</sup>:—

"Henry was not above sixteen when he first fell in love with this beautiful young lady, which seems to have been in A.D. 1149, whilst he was in England. He had by her two sons, William Longue Espée, Earl of Salisbury, and Geoffrey, elected in May of this year to the see of Lincoln. . . . Geoffrey was the youngest of Rosamund's sons, and at this time" (as Giraldus Cambrensis says in his *Life*) above twenty years old; and as it is certain that the King never had any more children by her, it is very probable that their connection broke off upon his marriage with Eleanor, and that the young lady, by a natural effect of grief and resentment at the detection of her lover, entered upon that occasion into the nunnery of Godstow, where she probably died before this rebellion, there being several benefactions made by her relations to that monastery, and confirmed by this King, in which she is mentioned as a deceased person."

It will be observed, on comparing the words of Miss Strickland with those of the historian Carte, that the former treats the historian's words with considerable freedom. Miss Strickland asserts that, according to Carte, we must confine Henry's connection with Rosamund to the two years succeeding his marriage, and that Carte has proved her profession at Godstow to have taken place within the same period. Carte really says that it is very probable that Rosamund's connection with the King and profession at Godstow took place at the time of the King's marriage. Carte says nothing at all of Henry's provision for his son, William Long-espee; and what he says on this subject regarding Geoffrey only bears on the question in as far as Giraldus Cambrensis is quoted to show that in the year 1175 Geoffrey was over twenty years of age.

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, vol. i., page 651.

<sup>2</sup> A.D. 1173.

But, in reality, the only point in Miss Strickland's statement with which we are much concerned is the date of Rosamund's separation from the King; and, though in this matter she seems to have assumed Carte to have proved what he himself says he has only made to appear probable, still we cannot blame her for this. For, later in the history of Henry II., speaking of those who suppose that the King's connection with Rosamund continued during many years of his life, Carte himself says, without any qualification, that he has "already shown their mistake as to the affair with Rosamund."<sup>1</sup>

But is the evidence adduced by Carte sufficient to show that Rosamund's connection with Henry ceased within a year or so of his marriage? Certainly the case is a very strong one, and, in the absence of any other reasonable theory, seems unanswerable. There is, in the first place, one argument left unnoticed by Miss Strickland; we refer to what Carte calls "the illustrious testimony given to Henry's conjugal chastity by the English bishops and clergy, assembled in a convocation of the province of Canterbury, in their letter to Pope Alexander,<sup>2</sup> in the heat of the dispute with Becket, when every idle story or calumny was caught at and spread, to blacken, if possible, his character."<sup>3</sup> We are not concerned with the spirit in which these words are written; but it is obvious that great weight must be attached to a public testimony thus given, in the midst of a violent struggle, by the English bishops, to the King's conjugal fidelity. No doubt there is much exaggeration contained in this very letter—a letter written in the King's favour. But, on the other hand, it seems incredible that the words we have quoted<sup>4</sup> could have been introduced into an official document of this character, if at the time, or for any considerable time during his married life, the King was known to have a public and notorious *liason* with Rosamund.

<sup>1</sup> Page 728.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. St. Thom.*, lib. i., ep. 128. Among his virtues is numbered the fact of his being "in copula castimonie conjugalis castissimus."

<sup>3</sup> Page 652.

<sup>4</sup> See note above.

If such were the case, the less said by his friends on the subject of virtue of this kind, the better.

Then the fact that Henry's youngest child, by Rosamund, was born not many months after his marriage, must be taken as a strong corroboration of the evidence just adduced. For, as Carte remarks, it is certain that Geoffrey and William Long-espée were the only children born of Rosamund. With regard to the date of Rosamund's entering the convent of Godstow, it is not easy to arrive at any very definite conclusion, though, no doubt, it is extremely probable that it was at the time of her separation from the King. Tradition certainly seems to hand down that Rosamund spent some years in penance at Godstow before her death; and since we know of no other time when she can have left the secret tower, except shortly after the King's marriage, this fact also goes to strengthen the early date of her separation from the King.

According to Miss Strickland, indeed, this question is decisively settled by the existing charters respecting Godstow nunnery. "That Rosamund was not killed," she says,"<sup>1</sup> may be ascertained by the charters before named, which plainly show that she lived twenty years, in great penitence, after her retirement from the King. . . . Now, the charters collated by Carte prove that the acquaintance of Rosamund and Henry commenced in early youth, that they were nearly of the same age, and that their connection terminated soon after Queen Eleanor came to England." If Carte was able to deduce all this from the Godstow Charters, he must have had a marvellous faculty for reading between the lines. For these documents consist simply of certain donations made to the nunnery by Walter de Clifford<sup>2</sup> and Osbert Fitz Hugh, and confirmed by the King; donations made for the repose of the souls of Margaret Clifford and her daughter Rosamund, and apparently for no other reason.

Hearne, however, shows<sup>3</sup> that the story propagated by

<sup>1</sup> Page 263.

<sup>2</sup> *Deplah Tetra*, A.D. 1250. Monasticon, c. Godstow.

<sup>3</sup> Notes to William of Newbury.



Stow<sup>1</sup> as to the poisoning of Rosamund by the Queen at Woodstock, in 1176, is entirely without foundation. According to Hearne, Rosamund lived for many years on terms of intimacy with the nuns of Godstow, and that, too, before her relations with Henry had ceased. That seems most unlikely, considering the high character always borne by the religious of that convent. But, at the same time, the story may contain an element of truth. It is not unlikely, far from it, that when Rosamund retired from Woodstock—say, shortly after the King's marriage—she went to live with the nuns at Godstow, with whom she had been on affectionate terms in early life. There, in all probability, she resided for many years, not as a nun, but as a boarder, in prayer and penance. Thus would be reconciled the story told by Carte, and taken up by Miss Strickland, with the opinion of the learned antiquarian Hearne. The offerings made to Godstow by Walter de Clifford and others would be accounted for, and the erection of a rich tomb to the memory of Rosamund would be explained. For, on this supposition, she would have retained her worldly rank, and would naturally be honoured in this way by the King and her family. This seems to us to be the true story of Rosamund's life and death; and, if it be so, it is entirely irreconcilable with the story told by Lord Tennyson.

What a contrast there is between the Becket of Lord Tennyson, and still more between the real Becket, and the Anglican bishop of our own days. St. Thomas was a celibate and an ascetic of the most austere type. Of how many of the Anglican bishops can the same thing be said? St. Thomas loved the poor man and the labourer. He had the confidence and esteem of the masses of the people. Is that the case with the Anglican episcopate? Have their lordships any hold on the labouring classes in this country? Finally, St. Thomas was a staunch and invincible champion of the rights of the Church. He fought for them. He died for them. How many of the princes of the Establishment are ready to suffer persecution

<sup>1</sup> *Annals*, page 154.

in the same cause? The Bishop of Lincoln, the model ritualistic bishop, some time since defended for a time some conscientious views of his in regard to the mode of officiating in the Communion Service. He resisted for a time, but in time of temptation he fell away.

J. A. HOWLETT, O.S.B.

---

### PALESTINE IN 1893.

SOME would-be pilgrim to the Holy Land finds himself, perhaps, in a plight similar to that which the writer was in a few months ago, seeking reliable information how to get to the Holy Places, and how to see them, and hearing somehow only uncertain and misleading statements. Fellow-feeling makes us always wondrous kind; but a desire besides to smooth the way for Irish pilgrims, and so far help to swell their number urges me, and so this paper sees the light. Having had the privilege to make the trip this year, and having seen nearly all the chief parts of the Holy Land, I merely tell something of what I got together at the cost of much time, vexation, and fatigue.

Two thoughts come to the mind of the pilgrim:—1. How can I get to the Holy Land? 2. How can I best see the Holy Places?

As to the first question, there are many ways of going to the Holy Land, and the choice from among them will probably be directed by two considerations—the length of one's purse, and the time at one's disposal. There are expensive ways of going, and ways less expensive. By the least expensive way the trip can hardly be done from Dublin and back under £40, and this way will occupy fully two months; by the shortest, and thereby the dearest way, the trip can be made first class all through for well within £100, and the time required will be five weeks. The least expensive way is to take passage from Liverpool by one of the many trading lines, comfortable enough steamers, that sail each week for Alexandria. The quickest way is to rail to Brindisi, and catch the P. and O. to

Alexandria. By this route you can at present reach Jerusalem from Dublin within nine days. Thus:—leaving Kingstown on a Thursday evening, you catch the Indian mail that leaves Charing Cross at 3 p.m. every Friday. It has sleeping and dining cars, and runs through to Brindisi in forty-eight hours. The P. and O. sails on Sunday evening, and should have you in Alexandria on Wednesday evening or early on Thursday morning. The Khedivie steamer sails from Alexandria at 10 a.m. on Thursdays for Jaffa, and gets there in about twenty-six hours; and, if you do not get half drowned in landing or over-plagued at the Custom House, you should catch the train for Jerusalem at two o'clock, and be within view of the Holy City at six o'clock on Friday evening, just eight days after leaving Dublin. But, of course, this rush is not to be made unless one is driven to it by some urgency.

A pleasant way to go is by Naples to Alexandria. A moderately expensive way is from Marseilles by the Messageries line of steamers, which now sail direct to Jaffa, and get there in about ten days. But by whatever way you select to get to Alexandria you had better ascertain beforehand the sailing of the steamers for the Syrian coast. There are three lines that do this traffic at present from Egypt—the Khedivie, the Austrian Lloyd, and the Russian. If possible, do not select the last named; it is not clean, and the *cuisine* is poor.

Let us consider the second question: How can I best see the Holy Places? Of course there is no difficulty about Jerusalem and its surroundings. You go to the Casa Nova, kept by the good Franciscan fathers, in Jerusalem, or to one of the several good hotels there, where a dragoman is recommended to you—he is indispensable—who shows you everything. Guide books abound—at least Protestant ones: let these last alone. An admirable, but rather voluminous guide book to the Holy Land has been brought out by Fr. Lievin, O.S.F. A compendium of it, or rather an excerpt from it, the part describing Jerusalem, and the Holy Places in the vicinity, was published in English, about a year ago, for the convenience of the

English pilgrims, and can be had for a small sum. Among the many useful hints it gives it tells us of the best time to visit the Holy Land. If there be a question only of climate, decidedly the best time is from the middle of March to the middle of May; September is also a fair time. But the Holy Week, and the Russian-Greek Holy Week, which comes some days later, are not times to be in Jerusalem. The crowding, which is nearly always much there, is then very unpleasant, and not without danger from the sects. The turmoil, besides, spoils all devotion, although it somewhat helps faith, seeing how these many and diverse worshippers are one in their allegiance to our Lord's life and death.

You can easily do Jerusalem and all the holy spots in the vicinity within a week. What then! of course there is the longing to see Nazareth. But how to get there! Nazareth is sixty miles up country. You inquire, and are told it is a four days' journey, which has to be made on horseback, camping out. You meet some hardy travellers who dilate on the charms of the trip, its freshness, its picturesqueness. You are tempted. Shall you try it! *Credè esperto et credibili*: it does not pay. The cost is from £2 to £3 a day each—you can indeed get housed at night *en route*, roughly enough, as the writer well remembers, but at some less cost—the risk from Bedouins is not little, the fatigue is great, and the sight-seeing is gravely disappointing. But then are you to leave Nazareth unvisited! Surely not; but you can get to it in another and more convenient way.

In a few months—nay, perhaps this very autumn—all that is worth visiting in the Holy Land, at least all the spots that are of special interest from the life and labours of our Lord, can be got to with comparatively little fatigue. Jerusalem and its surroundings can be thus reached at present. When you have done Jerusalem, return to Jaffa, having timed the up steamer—at present the only one is the Austrian Lloyd's—which calls at Kaifa. Land there. It is a six hours' sail from Jaffa. You land under Mount Carmel, and then you are within twenty miles of Nazareth. Ordinarily there is a good road, but just now a railway is



being constructed from Kaifa to Damascus, which will go within a mile of Nazareth. In Nazareth you have again a Franciscan Hospitium, and a capital, clean, and good in every way, German hotel. From Nazareth you can by daily excursions see the sweetest spots. The Sea of Galilee is only a five hours' ride. You can reach the summit of Thabor in three hours; Cana is only a pleasant walk, and Nain and Gelboe an easy ride. From the hills around Nazareth you can look down on the ruins of Jezreel, where Jezebel met her fate; you can look far out on the plain of Esdraclon, and catch a glimpse of Dothain, fresh and fertile as when the sons of Jacob fed their flocks there.

Thus the Holy Land is best seen. I should by no means wish to seem to decry any of its sacred spots. Every inch of it is historic, and of most thrilling interest; but in many places, at present, its sight is saddening. In that long up-country ride from Jerusalem to Nazareth, how little remains of the greatness the land once knew! Bethel, where Jacob had the vision of angels, is little better than a swamp. Samaria is an utter ruin; some colonnades of a Crusader's church, and the cave where lay awhile the body of St. John the Baptist, until, to please Julian, it was hurled out, defiled, and burned, are all one sees. There is ruin and dirt and desolation everywhere. One oasis, indeed, is there in the vast void—the well of Sichar, with water plentiful and sweet as when, so long ago, He sat by it to win the poor Samaritan back to God.

Of course, if the way was quite safe, and one had leisure, and if some of the ordinary conveniences of travel were easily available, it should be a delight to linger over every spot of this singularly-gifted land, and, with Old Testament in hand, to recall the unequalled scenes it knew. Mayhap the days for this are coming. When the country is opened up by railways—let no one who has seen things as they are call them a desecration there—and when the ruling Turk is made to bestir himself—or, better still, perhaps, driven out—there will be hope for Palestine. Its people are a thrifty, intelligent, and earnest race; but their life is slavery under Turkish rule. It is but true to say that the up-country trip

has some gleams of comfort. It opens one's eyes, and pleasantly astonishes one, by the beauty and fertility it reveals. I do not know if the notion be very common—certainly it is not uncommon—that Palestine is a blighted and a barren land. Why, at this hour it is yet a land flowing of milk and honey. Flocks and herds are there in thousands; there are the sweetest hills and richest valleys. Plains, far as the eye can reach, roll along its seaboard, wavy with plenteous corn. The whole contour of the land is not unlike our own County Wicklow. What might not this land become! Yet in what state is it! Why, in that long line of country, from Jerusalem to Nazareth, there is not one single roadway, nor an attempt at it; there is not one single bridge over its many streams. The Turk takes everything; he gives and does nothing.

A last word—the learned reader must forgive it: let not the pilgrim be led too far by the speculations that he will hear as he goes as to the authenticity of some of the sacred places from folk seemingly on pure exploration bent: “Is this the site of Calvary, or is that?” Each day almost is some fresh proof forthcoming of how very wise is Catholic practice in accepting as truth what carefully-guarded tradition brings us. Just now we have this, the avowal from Dr. Schick, the eminent German antiquarian, who has given forty years to exploration in Palestine, that all the probabilities are in favour of the Catholic site of Calvary as the true one. A source of uncomfortable reflection must this be to the zealous sectaries who, within these few months, swelled the coffers of the Turk by the fair sum of £13,000 for the purchase of the imaginary Calvary outside the Damascus gate, on which poor General Gordon had set his heart. No, let us have the spirit of vain scrutiny behind, and go on our way in humble lovingness to see where our Lord lived and died.

F. M. RYAN.

## "HORÆ LITURGICÆ:" OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL.

## IV.

## SOME MASSES FROM THE "COMMUNE SANCTORUM."

IN our former papers we studied some of the Masses from the *Proprium de Tempore*; and now, taking advantage of this season after Pentecost, when Holy Church bids us consider the spiritual life either in the teaching of our Divine Master Himself or in the examples of His saints, we purpose selecting from the *Commune Sanctorum*, the Masses more frequently said. We will apply them to certain saints whose feasts are kept about this time, and will try to show what light the Breviary casts upon these common Masses; and we may be somewhat surprised to find how full of particular meaning a Mass becomes when viewed in this way. These Masses we often say, and their words are familiar to us as some oft-heard strains of music which, sweet though it be, yet by constant use falls unheeded upon the ear. We miss a great deal, thereby; for we may take it as a certainty that Holy Church has some wise end in view in appointing, say, for some confessor, the Mass *Os Justi*, instead of *Justus ut palma*. We venture to think that the short study we offer on these Masses will, at least, point out the way wherein lies the reason of the Church's choice; and, in helping us to apply to one saint that which is common to many, remove one of the fatal effects of constant repetition.

Holy Church has herself given us the means of avoiding this fault, and has pointed out the way by putting into our hands the Breviary. In it we get, as each feast comes round, an account of the saint's life, and the more striking events of his history; and if we meditate a little on these points, short though they be, we will soon discover the rich light they throw upon the Mass we have to say. The words we use will get a fresh and ever-changing meaning, according to what we have read about the saint; and his example and deeds will rise up in our mind when we stand

before God's altar, and will help us more worthily to fulfil our duty of praising Him Who is the King of the saints. How many times has it not been said that the Office is to the Mass as the rich setting of gold worked by a cunning hand is to the jewel of great price which it encircles? Each enhances the beauty of the other, and itself gains in meaning and depth. Thus Matins and Lauds devoutly said are a perfect preparation for our morning sacrifice; and the hours that follow are tuned to the note of thanksgiving for what we have received. Holy Church has always insisted upon the prime importance of Matins and Lauds being said before Mass, and has not hesitated to insert in the general rubrics of the Missal the counsel, if not the precept, *Sacerdos celebraturus . . . saltem Matutino cum Laudibus absolute*, &c. She evidently regards it as an understood thing that this much of the Office, *at least*, is to be said before celebrating; and theologians concern themselves with the question of the sinfulness of those who do not observe this custom.

Now, here we are not concerned with the question of *sin*, but only of *usefulness*; and we will see how much we lose if we neglect this practice; and, if we observe it, how greatly it helps us to say our Mass *digne, attente et devote*. But if we desire to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God (St. Mark iv. 11), we will not content ourselves with the slight knowledge as the saint we can gather from the Breviary. This much is indeed necessary, and Holy Church desires us to have at least it, in order to celebrate as we ought. But we will seek to go down deeper into "the depths of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God" (Rom. x. 10), as manifested in the greatest act that can be wrought. We will follow St. Philip's advice as to the books we read. "Read those," said the saint, "which begin with the letter S;" that is to say, the lives of the saints. A study of the lives of God's servants can surely compete, at least in interest and profit, with the literary garbage which, as a rule, covers the reading-tables to-day. The journals, magazines, novels, and other forms of light literature, only serve to distract us; and often the thought of what we have read



comes back to us at the most unfitting time : whereas the lives of the saints help us on wonderfully in that which, before and above all things else, is our *work* ; namely, our Mass and Office, and it aids us to do them in a way most pleasing to the Lord we serve.

We will, then, take some of these Masses, not in the order they come in the Missal, but as we find them in the calendar for this season ; they will serve as examples of the manner in which we may treat them and the other Masses as they occur during the rest of the year.

THE COMMON OF A CONFESSOR : THE MASS “OS JUSTI.”  
(St. Cajetan, August 7th.)

“The King of Confessors, come let us adore.” So sings Holy Church to her children in inviting them to the service of Him whom St. Cajetan preached and confessed before men with much power and efficacy, “the Lord co-operating withal” (St. Mark xvii. 20) by signs and wonders. This same “King of Confessors” we are going to offer in sacrifice to the Eternal Father in honour of one of His servants.

The Introit (Ps. xxxvi.) is taken from that wonderful psalm, *Noli amulari*, in which is painted a lively picture of the life of God’s servants here below. Amid storm and tempest which must need try the soul of him who “set his face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem” (cf. St. Luke ix. 51), yet peace, perfect peace, possesses his heart. He rests in the Lord, and commits all his ways unto Him ; and the Lord bringeth forth the righteousness of His servant as the light, and his judgment as the noon-day (cf. Proverbs xvi. 3 ; St. Matthew vi. 25). “The mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom, and his tongue telleth of judgment ; *for* the law of his God is in his heart. Pret not thyself about the ungodly : neither be thou envious against them that work iniquity.” St. Cajetan, after he became a priest, as we read, became so inflamed with divine love, that he gave up his post at the Papal Court, and fretted not about the doings of the world. He fixed the law of God deeply in his heart, and set all his soul “to seek peace and pursue it.” (1 Peter iii. 11.) He laboured with such loving assiduity for the good of souls

with such ingenious invention of means for gaining them, that he was called "the hunter of souls." Nearly eight hours a-day did he pass in prayer, and "meditated wisdom" so deeply that he was often wrapt in ecstacy; "his tongue" too "spoke of judgment," for God gave him the gift of prophecy. He was not stirred by the prosperity of evil-doers, nor with their success, for all his care he had cast upon God, and committed everything to His providence. On this sure rock he was "most constantly" fixed, and never was he forsaken. Miracles, as we read in the fifth Lesson, were often wrought to confirm and show God's pleasure in his trust.

The Collect is proper for the day, and speaks of the encouragement we should have by the example of holy Cajetan, always to put our trust in Providence, and to seek only heavenly consolations, not minding earthly desires. The common Collect of this Mass breathes the same spirit, *etiam actiones imitemur*.

The Epistle (Eccli. xxxi.) gives us a description of our saint drawn by the hand of the Holy Ghost: "He was found indeed without stain" from his earliest infancy. Dedicated as he was to the care of our ever-dear and blessed Lady, he was remarkable, even as a child, for his innocence, and was called by all who knew him "the saint." "After gold went he not," but gave up all that the world could promise to follow his Divine Master; and he founded an order of religious whose life and rule was based on the observance of the greatest poverty. He would not allow his brethren to beg even in their greatest want, but he taught them to rely only on God's providence, for "he hoped not in money or riches;" he knew that the Heavenly Father knoweth that we have need of food and raiment (cf. St. Matt. vi. 32). Greatly then does he deserve our praise for giving us so great an example, and eternal shall be his glory. "When he could have done evil," by betraying to wicked men the patrimony of the poor, "he did it not;" but bore patiently stripes, torments, and imprisonment. Therefore are his good deeds made firm in the Lord, and Holy Church extolleth to-day the praise of his loving-kindness to his neighbours.

The Gradual (Ps. xci.) praises him as the just man, who flourishes like the *palm tree*, which is lofty and beautiful in its straightness among other trees, and as the *cedar* of Libanus, which gives beauty and strength to the house of the Lord by its incorruptibility and sweet smell. St. Cajetan was indeed all this. His holiness and singleness of aim raised him “from his shoulders upwards higher than any of the people” (1 Kings, ix. 2), even as the palm tree is above the other trees of the forest. His love for the splendour of God’s worship and for the beauty of His house; his exact observance of the holy rites; his great and burning devotion to that Source of all heavenly fragrance and incorruption, the true Cedar of our souls, the most Adorable Sacrament; his childlike love of Mary; his courageous defence of the faith against heretics—all these were characteristics of his life, and made him give forth a sweet odour of holiness. His spirit “was multiplied in the house of the Lord” by the order he founded; and, still flourishing, it keeps fresh the perfume of the name of Cajetan upon the earth. “In the daytime” he showed forth the *mercy* of God by his countless works of charity, and “in the stillness of the night” did he manifest the *truth* of God. For his humble prayers and lowly adorations, his disciplines unto blood and his heroic mortifications, were the witnesses that he knew that the very *truth* of God was that in the Divine Presence he was only dust and sinful ashes. Praise we then “God who is wonderful in His saints” (Ps. lxxvii. 36) with the joyful cry, Alleluia. Many trials did holy Cajetan undergo; but by them was he made perfect. Now they are passed away, and he wears for ever the crown of life. God set the seal of His approval on the holiness of His servant by the many miracles wrought during his life and after his death; therefore sing we again Alleluia in thanksgiving.

The Gospel (St. Matthew vi.) is proper to the feast. St. Cajetan saw that no man can serve two masters; so, having given himself to God in the priesthood, he determined that the Lord indeed should be his lot and portion. Therefore he broke with all the ties which bound him to the world. He would love the Master he had chosen, and would despise

the other, whose service he had refused. All his care was in Providence, for he knew that the soul was more than the body. The first thing for him was the spread of God's kingdom and His justice. With holy ingenuity he, like a skillful huntsman, set snares for souls. He built hospitals with his own money; and, giving more than money, he gave his own labour and care so as to win souls for Christ, and to make His kingdom come in their hearts. He knew well that God was to be found in the person of His poor, and that the surest way of making Christ live in him was to see Christ living in His suffering members. Thus, according to the common Gospel of this Mass, he held himself always ready to meet his God, for he was always in his Lord's company, and kept His law ever in his heart. By his mortifications he had his joints girt, ready to quit this world when the summons came; by his faithful trust in Providence the lamp was ever burning in his hands; for he lived not as one without hope; but he was saved by hope, and waited for it with patience (cf. Rom. viii. 24, 25).

Now let us listen to what God tells us in the Offertory (cf. Ps. lxxviii.) in praise of His servant. " My truth and My mercy are with him, and in My Name shall his horn be exalted." We have seen how in his mortal days St. Cajetan loved and honoured God's truth and mercy, and now that his might has been exalted even to a throne among the princes of his people, the mercy of God still follows him (cf. Ps. xlii.), and bathes his soul through and through with the glory which comes from truth which abideth for ever. The Proper Secret, like that of the Common, is a prayer for help, through the saint's pleading, now that we are about to commence the Canon. We may recall his great love for God's worship, and stir up our devotion to the Adorable Host after his example. " Blessed indeed is the man whom the Lord findeth watching," says the Church in the Communion (St. Matthew xxiv.). One Christmas night at Rome, whilst watching in prayer by the Grail, St. Cajetan was blessed indeed; for he saw in vision the Blessed Mother with the Child in her arms; and she graciously smiled upon her servant, and in token of her love placed the Little One in his



arms. We too are blessed at this moment, for by Mary’s kindly prayers Jesus is in our very heart, and is now living within us. How blessed are we above all others ! “ Over all His goods hath the Lord placed ” St. Cajetan, and hath made him to reign with Him for ever. Such is the reward laid up for us, too, if we are found watching and faithful. That God in His mercy, through the intercession of St. Cajetan, may so deign to grant, is the burden of the Post-Communion.

THE COMMON OF A VIRGIN : THE MASS “DILEXISTI.”  
(St. Clare, V., August 12th.)

“ The virgins’ King, come let us adore ; ” Him “ the virgins’ Crown ; ” Him “ who feedeth among the lilies,” girt about with virgin choirs, Him we are going to offer as our Eucharist to the Eternal Father, in thanksgiving for His graces bestowed on St. Clare ; and we make lowly supplication that “ by her praying, God in kindness may forgive us the pains due to our sins.”

The Psalm from which the Introit is taken (Ps. xliv.) celebrates the mystical espousals between the Lamb and His wife (cf. Apoc. xix. 7), and the lavishness of the gifts with which He adorns her. In the first words of the Introit we see why St. Clare was thus chosen *ex-millibus* : “ Thou hast loved righteousness and hast hated wickedness ; therefore hath God, thy God, anointed thee with the oil of gladness above all thy fellows.” Holy Clare, guided by the sweet saint of Assisi, left the world, being set on fire with the love of the Righteous One ; and hating iniquity in every shape and form, she would have none of what St. Paul calls “ the root of all evil ” (1 Tim. vi. 10), but gave away all she had to the poor. Thus did she take God alone as her possession, and made Him in a special sense “ *her* God ; ” for in the measure that she gave up the world, so did she possess God more entirely. Then did He in the day of her espousals to Him, anoint her with the oil of gladness, so that in her hard penitential life she ever rejoiced, for she knew that she was growing in likeness to her Heavenly Spouse. She was set above her fellows, and called to rule her convent, so that she

might train up to God other spouses, well-pleasing in His sight; and she has been set up in high heaven above her fellows, for she has taught many the way of life. In the verse of the Psalm the Church recalls "the good Word," none other than Jesus, the Eternal Word, whose image Clare was, and that "good word" which she, like Mary, ever kept in her heart" (St. Luke ii. 51); and Holy Church, grateful for the graces of her child, reminds the King of her works, the rich harvest that grace had borne in her soul, as we read of in the sixth Lesson. So the *Gloria Patri* becomes a song of thanksgiving to the King, the Three in One, who hath shown forth His glory in His handmaiden Clare.

God alone is our salvation, and from Him do we get grace to "make our calling sure" (2 Peter i. 10). He is moved to grant us what we need by the influence of St. Clare; and we, in thinking on her life, as the yearly feast comes round, are led to make use of the same means of devotion as she did, and thus reap the same fruit." This is the burden of the Collect.

In the Epistle (1 Cor. x.) St. Paul gives us, as it were, a sketch of St. Clare's life. She did not commend nor glorify herself; but in all humbleness she shrank from the world, and hid herself in the cloister. But God commended and approved her by the gift of miracles. How her life must have seemed folly in the eyes of her friends, who strove to hinder her vocation! But Holy Church was jealous of her with the jealousy of God, and would not suffer this stainless lamb to be ravaged from the fold, but, by the hands of St. Francis, led her out to that "country church," where she was to meet her Spouse. There did she plight her troth to Him who is ever faithful and true; and now, after forty-two years have passed, "the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath prepared herself" (Apoc. xix. 7); she is "presented as a chaste virgin to Christ," to follow Him whithersoever He goeth.

The same thought is borne out in the Gradual. "In comeliness and in thy beauty set out, go on prosperously and reign. Because of truth and meekness and justice; and thy right hand shall wonderfully lead thee. Alleluia,

Alleluia. Virgins shall be brought unto the King after her, and those near to her shall be brought to Thee in joy. Alleluia." How the life of St. Clare is mirrored in these inspired words ! From the day that she set out under the leadership of St. Francis, her heavenward career flowed on without check or hindrance, for her heart was enlarged and she ran in the way of the Commandments (cf. Ps. cxviii) : and she reigned over herself by *truth*, that is by knowing that she was nought, and that God was all in all ; by *meekness*, in which she possessed her soul, and so did reign in the land of God, *i.e.*, her soul ; and by *justice* to both God and man, " fulfilling all justice " (St. Matthew iii. 15). For herself there was but the one tunic and mantle of common and rough cloth, with the sharp hair shirt ; for her the bare ground for a bed ; for her justice, truth, and meekness meant three days a week of unbroken fast, and but scanty food the other four. But for others, for her sisters in the Lord especially, we read of the wonderful miracles she wrought for their need. Truly now does she reign, and has received the crown which the Lord hath prepared for her from all eternity ; and with this crown there is that other crown of virgins whom she has brought to the King in her train, of those who were near to her, and who called her their mother. She is indeed comely among the daughters of the city of the great King.

In the parable of the Ten Virgins, five wise and five foolish, which forms the Gospel of this Mass (St. Matthew xxv.), we see another picture of our saint. All baptized souls Holy Church would present " as chaste virgins to Christ," " unspotted from the world " (St. James i. 27) ; but all are not wise as St. Clare was. " All are called to be virgins," says St. Gregory, " but yet all are not received within the gates of bliss."<sup>1</sup> Now, the parable speaks of this life, and of the doings of those who are filled with heavenly light ; and the same holy doctor in commenting on this Gospel says these words, which apply so well to St. Clare :—  
" There are many who are continent, who keep themselves

<sup>1</sup> Hom. iv. Nocturn.

from desire of outward things, and by hope are drawn away to those things that are within. They punish the flesh, and in all their desires sigh after the home above; they wait for the everlasting rewards, and care not to have praises from men as the rewards of their labours."<sup>1</sup> How well did Clare keep the oil of good works ever at hand, and her lamp of faith ever burning! Her Spouse made a long delay, and oft did she sigh for His coming. For well-nigh half a century did He tarry, and Clare slept. Not with the sleep of sloth and forgetfulness, as did the foolish virgins: but "in peace; in the self-same did she sleep and take her rest, for Thou, O Lord, didst singularly stablish her in hope" (Ps. iv.). When the cry came, "Lo! the Spouse cometh," for her those words meant, "Come, Thou shalt be crowned" (Cant. iv. 8); and, rising up, she joined the white-robed throng of virgins who, with their queen at their head, appeared to her at her deathbed: and with them she entered "into the marriage-supper of the Lamb" (Apoc. xix. 9). The golden gate is closed, for never more can she lose the reward nor the crown prepared from all eternity for her. Here below she kept watch, for she knew not the hour; when it came she entered in: and now she standeth for ever before the great white throne, and is one of the fair lilies of Paradise which are gathered by the Beloved in the garden of this world (cf. Cant. vi. 2).

The Offertory is from the same Psalm which supplies both Introit and Gradual, and it tells us of that gracious vision St. Clare beheld when at the hour of death: "kings' daughters were there in thine honour; the Queen herself was at thy right hand in golden raiment girt about with all manner of loveliness;" and in such goodly company, strengthened with her Eucharistic Lord, did she go within the veil, and saw the King in all His beauty. In the Secret we pray that our oblation may be in honour of His hand-maiden, acceptable to the Lord, for we are made holy unto Him; and through her merits we ask for help in the hour of our greatest need—in the hour of our death. The Communion is a verse

<sup>1</sup>*Ibid.*, *cit.*



from the Gospel, and reminds us, when we have our Lord in our hearts, of the joy we ought like our saint to have when the cry sounds, "Lo! the Spouse cometh," especially when He cometh in Holy Communion. In the Post-Communion we pray, in other words indeed, the same prayer St. Clare used when she took the Blessed Sacrament in her hands, and with It's might drove back the Saracens from her convent. "Keep in safety Thy servants whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy Precious Blood;" and as surely does God answer us as He did the saint, when we conclude the prayer by calling on our Lord Jesus Christ, "I will always keep you in safety."

THE COMMON OF A DOCTOR: THE MASS, "IN MEDIO."

(St. Augustine, C.P.D., August 28.)

Again, it is the "King of Confessors" Holy Church bids us come and adore in the Divine Sacrifice; and this time it is to worship Him in union with and in thanksgiving for the Doctor of Grace, who by deed and word hath taught men to observe the Commandments; and therefore is he called "great in the Kingdom of Heaven."

The Book of Ecclesiasticus (xv.) supplies the Introit, and in it the Holy Ghost speaks of the work He does by His gift of wisdom in the souls of His saints. "In the midst of the Church did she (Wisdom) open his mouth; and the Lord hath filled him with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, and hath arrayed him in a robe of glory" (Ps. xci.). "Lo! it is a good thing to confess the Lord, and to sing unto Thy name, O Thou Most High." Wisdom marked out St. Augustine as her own from his tenderest years. A graceful docility and quickness of learning made him in a short time excel in wit all his companions. In his search after wisdom, human wisdom only then attracted him; he alas! went through the mire of heresy and vice, but at last fell under the happy influence of St. Ambrose, and from him learnt that "the fear of the Lord, that is Wisdom" (Job xxviii. 28); and becoming enamoured of her, cried, "Oh, where shall Wisdom be found?" (Job xxviii. 12); and the answer came to his soul that Wisdom, which is far above

rubrics (cf. Prov. v. 14), dwells with Prudence, and is with God. Converted to the only Wise, his life-work began; and soon "in the midst of the Church" did Wisdom open his mouth for the defence of the faith and for the teaching of the people. First, in the midst of the little church of Hippo as an humble priest; then as its bishop; and lastly, in the midst of the universal Church his mouth opened; and his words make it clear that the Lord hath filled him with a wisdom and an understanding not of this world. Even as a priest his sound had gone forth as the uncompromising opponent of the Manichean heresy and of Fortunatus; and as his light was to shine forth in all God's house, he was set up upon a candlestick, and was clothed with the robe of glory of the episcopate. How good it is to confess the Lord and to spread His Kingdom! How wonderful it is that one of us should be chosen for such a work, and that God should place the progress of His Kingdom in our hands.

The Collect is proper, and refers to the goodness of God in giving us St. Augustine as a teacher and example of confidence in His hoped-for loving-kindness, so that we may obtain the effects of His *accustomed* mercy. This is the same thought which underlies the general Collect of this Mass.

The Epistle (2 Tim. ii. 1) gives us St. Paul's advice to his beloved son, and also his own example of confidence in the eternal reward. This may all be applied to St. Augustine, for he was formed on the model St. Paul gives; and, indeed, there is much resemblance in character between the two saints. "Preaching the word, instant in season, out of season, reproving, entreating, rebuking in all patience and doctrine," perfectly describes the life of the holy Doctor. The Breviary tells us: "he ceased not to preach the Word of God, save when oppressed by great illness. He constantly pursued heretics openly, and by his writings, and in great part he freed Africa from the heresy of the Manichees, the Donatists, and the Pelagians. For in his day, the time had come "when men would not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own desire, having itching ears, they heaped unto themselves teachers, and were turned away

from the truth unto fables." But Augustine, like a true pastor, was "watchful," and "laboured in all things," doing "the work of an evangelist," thus "fulfilling in all soberness the ministry" given him by the Holy Ghost. Then the Epistle goes on to give a picture of his interior dispositions. "I am even now ready to be sacrificed." The life of a true teacher is indeed one of perpetual sacrifice . . . true till death; his life one of fighting against God's enemies, keeping the faith, and full of confidence that his labours for Christ will meet with a reward which God's justice cannot refuse. Then comes a word of hope to us also. We may look for this "crown of justice" if we love the coming of Christ, and make a reality to ourselves of the prayer, "Thy Kingdom come."

The Gradual (Ps. xxxvi.) meditates on the teaching of the Epistle, and reminds us that wisdom and justice go-hand-in-hand. He who gives God what He claims, that is our heart's love, is led by the Spirit of God, and is truly wise. His feet shall never slip out of the path. Praised be God indeed that He hath deigned to love one of His creatures as He hath loved Augustine; that He hath adorned him with the beautiful vesture of holiness, and set upon him "the stole of glory," the mark of heavenly jurisdiction as a teacher in the midst of His Church.

We have read St. Paul's description of a doctor; now in the Gospel (St. Matthew v.) we have our Divine Master's own words. The teacher of truth is to be like "the salt of the earth," "the light of the world." He must fulfil the law. St. Augustine was truly "the salt of the earth," and in this way. Salt has two properties: one, wherein it is likened to wisdom (*sapientia*) of bringing out the taste of food; and the other, of preserving from incorruption. Now, our saint, by his example and teaching, gives us a true taste for that which alone is good—God; for as he himself says: "O God, my heart was made for Thee, and can never rest but in Thee;" while the faith which he taught so well preserves us from the corruption of the world, according to the words of St. John, "The victory which overcometh the world is our faith" (John v. 4). Again, he was "the

light of the world: " for as the sun sheds his rays over all, and warms, benefits, and quickens wheresoever his beams fall on, so does our saint. In the midst of the firmament of the Church, God placed him as a great light, and his rays stream over all the faithful, warming and quickening the love of God in their hearts. What wonders for souls has not this one little ray of his light done. "*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis!*" His wisdom is like a city seated on a mountain, it cannot be hid; and all the world confess that St. Augustine is one of the greatest intelligences the world has seen. Then once more, he was a doer as well as a teacher of the commandments. As "love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10), so, "in the lesser things," he gives us an example worthy of all praise. He was humble and continent, moderate in bed and board, given to spiritual readings, kindly to the poor, and using for them in necessity even the property of the Church; guarded in his intercourse with women; and at last, when his hour was come, with many penitential prayers and sighs of sorrow for the sins of his youth, he "migrated to heaven," and is called therein "great."

We have the sum of his life in the Offertory (Ps. xci.), "Like a palm-tree did he flourish, and like the cedar of Libanus is he multiplied." A growth, gradual and continuous, led him on in the paths of justice and wisdom till he became the fair tree, tall and graceful, with all his branches responsive to the breathings of the Spirit. "His stature is like to a palm-tree (Cant. vii). Two things there are about the palm-tree which show us what sort of life his must be who aspires after perfection. There is the loftiness of the trunk, and the roughness of the bark. These show us that the way to holiness is hard to flesh and blood, and imply mortification. "I will go up," says the spouse, "into the palm-tree, and will take hold of the fruit thereof" (*ibid.*); and the fruit of the palm-tree St. Augustine gathered was true compunction and deep love of his patient Master. He is multiplied like the cedar of Libanus, "excellent as the cedar," for some of "the beams of our house are of cedar" (*ibid.*) of his planting. The holy orders which look to him as to their Father, have never ceased to strengthen the



house of our God, and to give forth the sweet smell of his virtues.

In the Secret Holy Church prays that his intercession may still continue for our benefit, and, joined to the holy sacrifice we are about to offer, may obtain our pardon. Because our saint was a faithful and prudent servant, the Communion tells us the Lord has set him on high amidst his heavenly family, and on earth "in the midst of the Church," to give us "the measure of wheat," whereon we may feed our souls. St. Augustine helps us by his teaching and example to use well "the measure of wheat," even the wheat of the elect, the bread of angels upon which we are now feeding. What a rich measure! How it is heaped up and overflowing in our bosoms! It is not the measure of our deserts, but the infinite measure of God's love! May he ever find us faithful and prudent; and this desire is fittingly expressed in the Post-Communion, in the prayer that the pledge of future glory, which has been fulfilled in St. Augustine, may do its work in us now by securing our salvation.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

*(To be continued.)*

## ROS-MIC-TREOIN.

BOSCUS FILII TRIANI.

NOVA VILLA PONTIS WILHELMI MARESCALLI.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH.

" Her battlements and towers,  
From off their rocky steep,  
Have cast their trembling shadows  
For ages in the deep."

THE valley of the Barrow comprises in its course some of Ireland's most beautiful scenery. In the literature of travel we hear but little of it now; its memories are silent, and the stillness of its scenes is seldom broken save by the

echo of the sportsman's rife amid its hills, or the boatman's cry from

“ The heavy barges trailed  
By slow horses,”

that glide by the river's margin. Like many parts of Ireland, though beautiful and romantic in itself, this Barrow country has lain wide of the tourist's track, and has long shared the neglect of forgetfulness. Yet memories as well as scenery there are here, and full ones too. A goodly page of record might be written for every mile of the Barrow's wanderings.

In Ireland's Celtic days its waters marked the territory of many a warlike clan, and its banks were, alas ! too often crimson-dyed in those indecisive conflicts that cloud the history of our land. In later times when the Norman claimed our shores, the Barrow played boundary to the English Pale: nor does the student reader fail to recall that the dowry of Eive, the daughter of Dermot, the bartered bride of Strongbow, was clasped within its silvery stream. Every ruin on its hills is celebrated in story—every motion of its waves calls up the spirit memories of the past. Whilst the associations of history and romance which once gave interest to those scenes, lie untold and almost forgotten, it is pleasant, in this material day, to find in those mouldering volumes the unheeded annals of the past glimmerings of history, which, like the smouldering fires of the Indian forests, still light up this pictured scene.

Lovely and varied as every stretch of the Barrow is, its most impressive pictures decidedly hang within those few miles that lie north and south of *Ros-mic-Treoin*.

“ 'Tis there it glides through meadows bright and gay,  
And huddles tiny, much ruined castles grey;  
By willow'd creek—by wild and craggy steep,  
Its broad'ning current onward nobly sweeps;  
But calm once more, it gently flows along  
To ocean's grave, with ceaseless murmuring song.”

Here the wooded banks, the towering castle, the purple hills, the rich pastures and the broad patches, dark in the seed-time, golden in the harvest, that stretch away

from the river's brim, form a whole that in any other land would attract crowds of artists and tourists. Tourists, alas ! they are few ; nor is there much done to attract them. It was only within the last decade of the present century that the iron road found its way to Barrow's banks and placed its gates beside those storied waters.

Ros-mic-Treoin, which signifies " the wooded promontory of Treon," was, in the most distant times of which record tells, one of the fastnesses of Treoin, son of a famous chieftain of Leinster. The Barrow here flows full and rapid, and at the present day the appearance of the dismantled town, with its roofless abbey, which now covers the ancient site extending to the river side, impresses the imagination even of those who are unacquainted with its historical associations.

Most of the towns and cities of the Middle Ages owe their origin to religious foundations. The monks, or the anchorites who preceded them, did not, it would seem, disdain beauty of situation in choosing the sites of their abodes. As a rule, we find their monasteries, and the settlements that afterwards grew up around them, set in some delightful chapter of scenery. With the monks, it may have been, as with Isaac of old, that the running brook, the glad meadows, the purple hills or the winding river, lifted their thoughts heavenward. The wonders of creation may have been the volumes from which they read—and where could they have found books more ample of meditation ?

Thus, like many another spot of beauty, Ros-mic-Treoin was chosen by St. Abban for the site of his parent monastery early in the sixth century. The ancient scribes tell us, that Abban was one of the most remarkable of the missionaries of Ireland. He was nephew of Ibar, the pre-Patrician apostle of Wexford, and kinsman of Kevin of Glendalough. As a builder he seems to have beaten the record in his day, since we find his name associated with many foundations in the County Cork, and in other parts of Ireland ; while in the County Wexford alone twelve monasteries claim him as their founder.

St. Abban is said to have shared much of the missionary labours of St. Ibar, whom he accompanied on a journey to the Eternal city; and, no doubt, during his wanderings he did much to spread the fame of Ibar's island-school, Little Ireland, Wexford. His monastery of Ros-mic-Treoin was the favourite resting-place of Abban, which led to its being the most important of his many foundations.

Abban was succeeded in the abbacy of Ros-mic-Treoin by the scarcely less famous saint, Ewias, or Evin, in whose time this monastery attained its highest renown as a seat of learning. The old chronicles say that its halls were filled chiefly by students from Munster, who flocked to it in great numbers. The bell of St. Evin was preserved with much veneration, on the scene of his labours, till so late as the fourteenth century. In the far-off times the fealty of the clans was sworn upon it, and during the Norman period contracts of unusual solemnity were attested on the "bell of Evin."

The veneration of bells is much noticed in the records of the early ages of faith. The first missionaries, when setting out on their journeys, usually received each a bell as part of their credentials. A beautiful tradition exists in many parts of Ireland, and is also noted in some of the early lives, telling that of certain parting instructions, one was to ever hearken well, and wherever the bell sounded of itself, unswung by human hands, there to build a church. The blessed bell of Evin was, no doubt, a symbol of his divine office, and perhaps a miraculous one too. St. Ewias, of Ros-mic-Treoin, is said to have been baptized by St. Patrick, from whose hands he received his divine commission. It is a strange fact, and one very unusual with Irish saints, that not a shred of tradition survives, nor is his name even known in the place Evin once made famous.

In one of the Pembroke charters of St. John's Abbey, Kilkenny, 1308, reference is made to a church dedicated to St. Ewias as well as to that of St. Mary in the mediæval<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> New Ross, Co. Wexford.



town that rose upon the site of his abbey. And in a map of the same, showing the walls and fortifications in the fifteenth century, Evin-street is marked as the name of the hilly thoroughfare, known at the present time as Neville-street. This may have been the site of his church—the neighbouring eminence of St. Mary's.

Beyond the celebrity which the sanctity of Abban brought to the scene of his abbey, and the after-fame of Evin and his bell, there is little historical interest attached to Ros-mic-Treoin until the period of the Norman invasion. After that time the ancient name of the place, Ros-mic-Treoin, merged into that of the “Nova Villa,” or the New City, built by Isabella, daughter of Strongbow. This was the first city fortified, or otherwise built by English hands on Irish soil, as its Latinized name tells, and as is echoed in the name attached to its site to-day. Its foundress, the grand-daughter of Dermot McMurrough, on the death of her father became ward of Henry II. of England, heiress to the crown and palatinate of Leinster, and representative of the highest chieftainage in Ireland. As a matter of policy the English monarch was anxious, by Isabella's alliance, to strengthen his claims to his newly-acquired dominions. Just then the most princely personage, and the most powerful noble in the Court was William, son of the Earl of Strigul, Marshal of England. This office of State, more important then than now, was long borne by his family as an hereditary right, and the present Marshal from his fame as a knight and a statesman was kinglier in pride, in state, in renown, and almost greater in possessions than the king himself. The fastest friend of the Plantagenet cause, he shared all the royal confidence; and when Prince Henry, the king's eldest son, lay dying at the castle of Turenne, he handed his cross to his dearest companion William Marshal, with the commission that he should bear it to Jerusalem. Those were the days of the Crusades.

The valour of the English Marshal on the holy fields was long the theme of ballad and song. His bravery in war was surpassed by the generosity—a trait rare in the captains of his age—which he extended toward his fellow-soldiers who shared

his halls. For policy, as we have said, Henry determined to bestow the hand of Isabella on the noblest knight of his kingdom, the Earl Marshal. At the time various opinions were entertained on the preference given to the Earl Marshal, in this alliance, over that of many rival candidates for the hand of the Irish heiress.

Some writers assert that the royal motive was to remove him to pastures new, lest at the English Court the royal supremacy itself might wane before the growing prestige and prowess of the house of Marshall. Be this as it may, Isabella and Earl William were betrothed, and though the King did not live to see the consummation of his desire, the marriage took place, 1189, on the return of his successor, Richard Cœur de Lion, from the Holy Land. In the following year, the old chroniclers tell us, Isabella set about building a beautiful city not far from her ancestral palace on the banks of the Barrow. Apart from the beauty of its situation, the site of Isabella's city possessed many other advantages. A mile or two above it the Barrow joined in confluence the Nore. The united waters thence sped on for a distance of some twenty miles, joining the Suir in their exit to the sea. By the water-side of the town the dual river was navigable to its fullest extent, but the point of vantage most appreciated was that here the "wooded promontory" narrowed the rushing tide and facilitated an easy span to the opposite territory of Ossory.

When the Earl Marshal saw with pride the *Nova Villa* rise as if by magic on the rugged hillside, or perhaps fondly gazing from the opposite shore on the beauty of its towers and spires, in the glory of the western sunset, he determined on sharing the munificence of his spouse--to span the Barrow, and lend a new approach to Isabella's city, the most lasting and loveliest charm of the scene. This noble thought gave birth to the first Bridge of Ross.

Those were not the days of electricity or steam; engineering skill was only in its infancy; and thus we can easily imagine how this first "bridge with wooden piers" was looked upon as one of the most marvellous works of the time.

From that period the bridge not only changed the character and associations of the place, but became part of its very name—*Ros-mic-Treoin* and *Roscus Triani*—gave place to *Ros-villae Novi Pontis*, and lastly New Ross. The first official reference we find of the changed designation is when King John, in 1211, during his progress from Waterford to Dublin, dates one of his dispatches from the *Nova Villa Pontis Whelhelmi Marscalli*. On the occasion of his visit the King confirmed to the Earl Marshal all the rights and privileges conferred on Earl Strongbow by his father, Henry II., at the same time giving the patent for the new town, and granting the device, or arms, of its corporate privileges.

Quarterings were not in use until after the Crusades, but devices to which great importance was attached, when few could write, were borne by corporations, abbots, or individuals, under the sign manual of the King. The device of the town of which we write often provokes curiosity; the scroll beneath, in old Latin, is difficult of translation, and to the passer-by serves but little to solve the puzzling emblem. The “Elk and the Stag Hound”—for such is the device—was the seal of the Earl Marshal; the scroll below is simply a recital from the patent of the King, by which he permitted the “official seal” (of the Earl Marshal), “surmounting a bridge” (in memory of his work), to be the sign “of the new city.”<sup>1</sup>

The magnificent viaduct which crosses the Barrow at the present time is the fourth that has spanned the site of William Marshal's bridge. In point of engineering art, or in beauty of design, it equals for its length any structure of the kind in Europe. For history's sake it is pleasant to find the Marshal's shield, with a fine impression in relief, has been appropriately placed above its swivel arch. The “strange device” and the scroll beneath now silently tell their tale of seven hundred years ago, when England's Marshal flung his “wondrous way” across to Isabella's towers, and when the worst of the Plantagenets signed his

<sup>1</sup> “Sigil. officii Novi. Ross. pontis. superiorat.”

parcament at the Nova Villa, permitting the Earl's seal to be the seal of Ross !

To our literary readers it may be of passing interest to recall that an episode of history of more than its civic importance is attached to this seal. In the last and more disastrous days of the same unfortunate King, when in his march from Lincoln the crown insignia and seal of the realm had been lost in the Wash, the deeds of confirmation were sealed with this seal. Again, in the early years of Henry III., when Pembroke, as protector, confirmed the *Magna charta* and the *Charta forestarum* in the name of the youthful sovereign, the royal grants recite:—"These liberties we send to you, our faithful subjects, sealed with the seal of our faithful William Marshal, the guardian of us and our kingdom, *because we have as yet no seal.*"<sup>1</sup>

Few of those who now cross at New Ross the splendid and still historic thoroughfare, feel they tread the monument of one of the greatest warriors or statesmen who ever figured on the canvas of English history. The basis of the constitution we enjoy, the boasted liberty of England is due to him, since it was he and Almaric, together with the mighty Langton, who wrung the Magna Charta from King John. Shakespeare has immortalized the Earl Marshal in one of the finest characters of his stage.<sup>2</sup>

The memories that are here awakened, and the associations they weave around our pen, would carry our sketch far beyond these pages. We must hasten to close. William Marshal, protector of England, died at Caversham, 1219. His body was carried to Reading Abbey, from thence to Westminster. From here it was borne in great state to the Temple Church, where it was solemnly interred on Ascension Day. His monument is still splendidly preserved, and much admired for the workmanship displayed in the chain armour and hood which decorate his effigy.

His glorious life had a sad and unfortunate end. He died under the bans of excommunication. This penalty was incurred by some illegal encroachments on the property or

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Rymeri*, tom i., part 1, page 146. Hen. III.

<sup>2</sup> King John.



privileges of the diocese of Ferns, in the episcopate of Bishop Albinus O'Molloy. A blight fell upon his race. Isabella, the foundress of Ross, died 1224, and was interred in Tintern Abbey, Wales. During the five years she survived her husband she never ceased to grieve for the unfortunate circumstance that befel his closing years. On her death-bed she foretold that the estates of her inheritance, or the earldom of Pembroke, would never be succeeded to in male line, a prediction which came true when her fifth and last son died without issue in 1245. Her sons, William, Richard, Walter, Gilbert, and Anselm, were successively earls of Pembroke, and almost all met violent deaths. Their possessions then passed between their five sisters. The title of Pembroke was borne thenceforth only by right of female succession for centuries, and became extinct in the House of Marshal in the reign of Edward IV., when it was exchanged for that of Huntingdon, to oblige that King, who conferred it on his own son.

Those few fragments of history will, we hope, awake a deeper interest in the scenes where they were enacted, and, if possible, add another charm to the pleasures of those who visit Isabella's city, or the site of William Marshal's bridge.

J. CULLEN.

#### SOME DEVOUT SUPERSTITIONS PRACTISED DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

“POPULAR practices, which have an essential hold on the human soul, are all more or less intimately connected with fetichism. The exclusion of such, then, from the liturgy cannot be too strongly insisted on, although on frequent occasions they seem to make an integral portion of it. With pagan nations, as with Christian nations, the foundation of superstition is the same. The same effects result from the same causes; the modifications of the legends are only exterior, the original idea always remains.” Thus writes M. de Mély in a recent issue of the *Revue de*

*l'Art Chrétien*; and in what he says there is much truth, though we cannot join hands with him in his seeming estimation of the Church's action in receiving into her liturgy, or in favouring with her protection or benevolent toleration, several of the rites and ceremonies of the pagan creeds which preceded her.

Divinely invested with a mission to restore all things in Christ, she exhibits, from her very first origin, that admirable spirit of comprehension, that breadth of view, which, in spite of the bigotry of some of her children, from age to age, has ever since emphasized her path; and thus she proceeds to accomplish her great work of universal renovation, to evangelize and civilize all the nations of the earth. Thus it is that she makes use of the materials which she finds to her hand, assimilating to herself and making her own all that is good, all that is beautiful, all that is true, in the manifold systems of religious thought which surround her. Thus, from the architecture which she found in vogue, she borrowed the elements of her temples; for the official expression of her liturgical prayer she adopted that musical idiom—venerable monument of Græco-Roman art—which in times gone by had been wont to re-echo in honour of heathen divinities. Nay, wresting, as it were, from his very hands Satan's most cherished weapons, she turned them against himself, and does not hesitate to combat the superstitious practices of an impure and idolatrous worship by the very same ceremonies, purified and made holy, which had formerly accompanied it; in a word, to fetishism to oppose sacramentalism. Thus, for example, she instituted the Rogations, and the processions on St. Mark's Day, and the procession of Candlemas, to counteract the Ambarvalia, in honour of Bacchus and Ceres; the Robigalia, in honour of Robigus, the god who kept blasting and mildew away from corn; and the Lupercalia, sacred to Pan. Thus she tells the peasant to transfer his allegiance from Terminus to St. Anthony, makes St. Nicholas take the place of Woden; instead of Neptune bids the mariner invoke the Star of the Sea. "O Wisdom, which comest forth from the mouth of the Most High, reaching to all the ends of the earth, mightily and sweetly setting all things in order!"

We do not for an instant mean to say that individual Catholics—or, may be, even individual Churches—have never been guilty of mingling superstitious practices with their devotions, or of confounding them together. Indeed, so fine is the line which divides them, that it is sometimes hard to say where the one ceases and the other begins; more especially as the motives which inspire actions of this kind are alone sufficient to qualify them; and these, for the most part, are, of necessity, hidden from view. In times gone by, however, when, on the one hand, all Europe was Catholic, and consequently faith, generally speaking, was more vivid, devotion more widespread, and when, on the other, the march of civilization had not as yet completely lifted the veil of ignorance and credulity from the eyes of the masses, we naturally find more striking examples than at the present day of this ill-assorted marriage of superstition with devotion, of fetishism with sacred rites.

In a paper lately read before the Académies des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, M. Lecoy de la Marche drew attention to several remarkable incidents of this sort. A document preserved in the National Archives of France, viz., an examination of a poor artist, suspected of carrying treasonable correspondence between the Duke of Burgundy and the Count of Maine, by Tristram l'Hermite, in the year 1471, forms the topic of M. le Marche's study. It was the eve, he observes, of the outbreak, for the second time, of the terrible war of the Bien Public, and that under conditions even more threatening than before. Not only were the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany and the Counts of Armagnac and Foix, as well as other great nobles, leagued together against their sovereign (Louis XI.), but foreign princes, like the King of Arragon and the Duchess of Savoy, were making common cause with the malcontents. The King's own brother, Charles Duke of Guyenne, was the heart and soul of the plot; and by his marriage with the heiress of Burgundy he meant to assure the triumph of the anti-French coalition. This marriage was the pretext for a continual interchange of communication between the two Courts; but the drawing up of the marriage settlement was

not the only object of all their *pourparlers*. The conspirators were in reality settling their plan of action for the coming fray. On all sides men were making themselves ready for battle; everything presaged a storm, in the midst of which the ancient monarchy, isolated from its friends, and left a prey to the common assault of its enemies, seemed destined to go down.

As it always happened in moments of danger, the old King was seized with an access of feverish activity, which this time took the form of an appeal to the devotion of all his faithful and loyal subjects; and Tristram—the redoubtable Tristram—undertook to guard the frontier of Guyenne, and to surprise the secret emissaries by means of whom Duke Charles kept himself informed of the dispositions of his confederates. Thus all those who came from Guyenne were, for the lynx-eyed marshal, objects of suspicion. Several arrests had already been made, which only served to incense the King's *entourage* with a violent animosity against all those who had any dealings with his Majesty's brother, when one day, at Mans, the vigilant eye of the local police discovered a wretched artist who had recently been to the Court of Duke Charles, and who had since solicited an audience from the Count of Maine, who, perhaps, of all others, was the man whom Louis most distrusted. The *rapprochement*, then, of these two names was significant. The humble artist was a confidential agent of Charles, charged by him to carry to the Count of Maine and his friends secret letters, or, at all events, verbal communications, having for their end to determine them to join the new confederation. What seemed to confirm this opinion was the fact that the fellow had about him a number of small sheets of paper and scraps of parchment, inscribed with certain strange hieroglyphics which no one could decipher. Hence Jehan Gillemier, *soy disant enlumineur, natif du Pays-du-Mayne, et à pusent demourant à Poitiers*, was arrested by Maître Guillaume Sufleau, Conseiller du Roi and Lieutenant de Justice, at Mans, and by him submitted to an examination, an official report of the same, as well as the explanations given by the accused, being drawn up by the registrar, Le Jarrier.



Tristram, on learning the gravity of the charge against him, had Gillemor and his papers transported to Tours, cases of this kind coming under his own special jurisdiction. He was then consigned again to prison, and was brought before the ruthless marshal, for the first time, on January 23rd, 1472. Although the whole of this last and solemn examination furnishes several interesting details concerning the manner of life of our ancient painters on vellum, and the way in which they exercised their craft, the space at our disposal forbids us to do more than call attention to those portions of it which illustrate the matter in hand, which exemplify some of the devout superstitions of our ancestors.

Among other questions, then, we find the following:—

“There have been found on you, prisoner, a number of papers containing prayers to divers saints, and formulæ for curing certain evils. Whence come they?”

“I obtained the prayers [said Gillemor] from the churches I have visited; the formulæ from different persons whom I have met in my travels. I learnt them in order that thereby I might endeavour to alleviate with them as well as myself, as all others who might demand my assistance.”

On February 1st, our artist was again examined; and this time the session was entirely devoted to sifting, one after another, of the various documents found upon him. The marshal believed that there was some hidden and treasonable meaning in their very number; Gillemor, that he was being accused of superstitious practices, and the main object of his defence, therefore, was to show that on this head he was innocent.

“What is the exact meaning [continued Tristram] of those little strips of paper, some in French, some in Latin, inscribed, Good for tooth-ache or for fever, and where did you receive each one of them?”

Our friend replied that he could not exactly say, only remembered that three years ago, when he happened to be at Croutelle near Poitiers, drinking in a tavern there, he was suffering from tooth-ache, when a person whom he had never seen before, accosted him, and offered, if he would, to cure

him; that upon his assenting, the stranger gave him a little piece of parchment, which he hung round his neck with a cord, and immediately the pain ceased; and for this he paid, he added, two sous and six Tournay mites. Asked whether he had ever suffered from tooth-ache since, he acknowledged that he had, and that he had again tried the remedy, but without any success.

"What use [continued Tristram] are certain psalms followed by a prayer, and three crosses interlaced?"

"A man named Guillonet [was the reply] gave them to me when I was at Paris about three years ago, and he assured me that they were good to carry about one, and that if I recited them every day before the crucifix, no evil would befall me; but I am ignorant of the meaning of the crosses, and as for the prayers, verily believe that they are naught but prayers."

"Why do we read [was the next question] below these same prayers the indication of different days of the month?"

"They are the unlucky days [said Guilemer] of the twelve months of the year. I copied them myself from a Latin book in the library of St. Hilary's, at Poitiers, and a Frenchman named Jehan Adven, who is since dead, translated them for me into French."

The marshal continued:—

"What use do you make of a picture, traced on a sheet of paper giving the measure of the figure of Jesus Christ?"

To this, our artist replied:—

"Some four or five years ago, when I was at Brussels, a pousuivant at arms, and a member, I believe, of the household of the Emperor of Germany, but whose name I do not know, gave me this paper, and told me that he had brought it from a convent of Grey Friars at Jerusalem, and that he who wore it need fear no evil: as to the crosses and the written characters, I am ignorant of their meaning."

At length the inquisitor came to a long roll of paper, on which were inscribed more prayers and crosses, together with a written assurance that the bearer would not die a sudden death; that if it were placed on a person possessed, the devil would go out from him; or on a woman in labour, and unable to be delivered, the child would be born; and that whosoever should recite the prayers daily, would be warned of his end three days before that event. To all this

Gillimer could only say that the paper had been given to him three years or more ago when he was at Lyons on his return from Lombardy, by a man of the name of Lehan Potier, of whose condition he was ignorant.

At the end of this roll of paper five little bands of parchment were attached. Of these, the first two contained other sacramental formulæ for the purpose of curing tooth-ache, and some indications of unlucky days; the third, the following enigma :—“ *Charles, au lundi, mercredi et vendredi ; Simon, au vendredi, assailliz ; André au mercredi ou au Jeudi ; Pierre au lundi, mercredi ou jeudi, accordez ; Guillaume, au Mercredi ; et se le dit Guillaume vous assault, si vous défendez ; Etienne, au Jeudi ou au lundi, et vous accordez.*”

Naturally, the marshal was curious to know the meaning of this singular conglomeration of words, and he asked what they signified; the explanation he received is no less curious than the formula itself :—

“ Three years ago [said Gillemér] or thereabout, when I was at Poitiers, working at my craft, I had with me five great hulking apprentices, with whom I could do nothing, and who even threatened me, did I so much as venture to open my mouth to them, so that I went in bodily fear. One day, therefore, I called on, Brother Jehan Boussin, the Grey Friar, and expounded to him my fears. ‘ Take courage, my friend,’ said he; ‘ I have a book of astrology, which I will go and consult, and therefrom will extract a note which will indicate for you, according to the names of your servants, on what days you may tranquilly command each one of them, and on what days you will expose yourself to their ill-treatment by so doing.’ Thus [continued poor Gillemér] I learned that I could safely order Charles to work on Wednesday and Friday; that if Simon begged any favour of me on Friday, I could refuse to grant it without laying myself open to his brutality; in like manner, as to Andrew, on Wednesday or Thursday; and so forth.”

Thus, observes M. de la Marche, this artist of the second or third water who travelled from place to place to dispose of the product of his handicraft, and a poor, weak-spirited creature into the bargain, had an *atelier* large enough to give employment to five assistants, who were perhaps his pupils; and although, it must be owned he was but little respected by them, nevertheless by the aid of astrology he at length

succeeded in knowing when and how he could make them work. Surely a curious detail of artistic manners not altogether without its analogy in the stormy trade disputes of the present day; though whether a strike or a lock-out, the modern equivalents we imagine to Peter and Simon's obstreperous brutality, could now be avoided by means of astrology, we leave it to the employers of labour to determine.

Astonished at such a collection of charms and talismans, Tristram finally inquired whether the accused had any familiar evil spirits, and whether he had not had recourse to the invocation of devils, from whom he had gained his knowledge of cabalistic signs, both of which he emphatically denied, adding that on the oath which he had taken, and on the damnation of his soul, that he had never made use of his precious secrets save in the manner in which he had described.

Such are the devout superstitions which Tristram's examination of this poor fifteenth century missal painter laid bare. Strange indeed are they, yet hardly less strange are some of the legends contained in the service books which he and his predecessors so skilfully adorned. Strange mingling of the beautiful and the grotesque, of deep and wondrous poetry and trivial jingling rhymes, of noble histories and old wives' tales of simple faith and naive superstition; how like these ancient prayer-books are to their fantastic capitals, their cunningly wrought and intricate borders, and how faithfully do they reflect the age in which they were written, when quaintness and beauty, rudeness and delicacy, discord and harmony, went hand in hand!

Again, those popular *fêtes*, half religious, half profane, which, so to speak, grew up in the Church during the Middle Ages, in spite of ecclesiastical authority, and in opposition to its censures, afford in more than one instance several remarkable examples of grotesque, extravagant, and superstitious devotion.

It has been suggested that the origin of these *bizarre* festivities is to be sought in the pagan saturnalia of Greek and Roman times; but the natural love for spectacular



representations inherent in the human race would alone be sufficient to account for them. When the common people, ground down by the tyranny of feudalism, had no other distraction than that offered by the solemnities of public worship, what more natural than that they should seek, from time to time, to instil a little mirth into their religious ceremonies? Be this as it may, inspired, doubtless, more by charity than by prudence, the local clergy would seem at first to have lent themselves to these displays, till at length bishops and councils found themselves face to face with indecent parades so deeply ingrained in the superstitious affections of the people that it took centuries to uproot them.

Thus the festival of the Holy Innocents was in some churches the excuse for grave extravagances, and in 1479 the Chapter of Rheims was constrained to raise its voice against excesses which accompanied its celebration in that city. The quaint Salisbury custom of choosing a boy-bishop to preside over the festivities of the children's festival is well known; but it is only fair to acknowledge that the office for Innocent's day contains in it nothing of the extravagant or the grotesque, but, on the contrary, is one of the most beautiful in the whole Sarum breviary, and in the richness and variety of its antiphons, responses, and so forth, far surpasses the corresponding office of the Roman rite.

The festival of the Sub-deaconite, too, first inspired, it would seem, by the characteristically Christian desire of glorifying humility, of exalting the lowly and meek, was at length celebrated with such a display of fantastic mirth that it became what it was actually called a veritable fool's festival—*Festum fatuorum*.

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that the voice of authority was never raised against these excesses. Du Cange informs us that in his day there was still extant a letter which the Cardinal Legate, Peter of Capua, addressed, in the year 1190, to Odo, Bishop of Paris and the canons of his cathedral, ordering them to utterly abolish "*that feast, called the feast of fools, which has gradually come to be observed in the Church of Paris, as well as in sundry other*

*churches.*" Moreover, in 1212 we find the Council of Paris, in 1259 the Council of Haponeza, in 1279 the Statutes of John, Archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1445 the Council of Rouen, condemning the same abuses. All these ecclesiastical censures, however, seem to have failed in their purpose, for later on in the fifteenth century the theological faculty of Paris felt itself constrained to send a letter to the bishops of France complaining that the old abuses were still prevalent.

The celebration of the *Festum Assinorum*, as kept at Beaunais and at Lens, and possibly also elsewhere, was likewise characterized by most reprehensible eccentricity. The 14th of January, the festival of the flight into Egypt, was the excuse for these buffooneries.

At Rouen the *Festum Assinorum* took place immediately after Tierce on Christmas Day; and if we can judge from the *Ordo processionis Assinorum secundum Rothomagensium usum*, as given by Du Cange, the function would seem to have been here celebrated with comparative decorum. It would seem to have been merely a processional and dialogued representation of some of the historical events, anterior to the birth of our Lord, which are recounted in Holy Writ. Among the characters personified appear Moses, Balaam on his ass, Zacharias, St. Elizabeth, St. John the Baptist, and even, on account doubtless of his fourth Eclogue, the poet Virgil and the Sybil.

Far be it from us to make ourselves, in any way, the apologists of profane and ridiculous customs; and such the practices which we have just recounted undoubtedly were; but, in forming our estimation of the person who took part in them, it is only fair to bear in mind the age in which they were prevalent, and the circumstances which rendered them possible. We must take men as we find them; and to judge the thirteenth century from a nineteenth-century standpoint would be like accusing an innocent child, or a naïve Irish peasant, of hypocrisy and vulgarity, because he had expressed himself in language which, in the mouth of a worldly old man, would be both vulgar and hypocritical. Moreover, it should be remembered that all these uncouth displays centre round the great festival of Christmas—a

festival which the Church, in her heavenly-inspired wisdom, had instituted to wean the people from, and to counteract the saturnalia of, pagan times.

While, then, on the one hand, the general spirit of license so prevalent at this season, during the latter Middle Ages, was doubtless but a survival of the spirit which had formerly characterized the licentious rites of the old false worship—a spirit, indeed, which had died down, but never became extinct, and which only needed the fostering care of circumstances and surroundings to make it burst out anew in all the wild delirium of its former fury: on the other, the subjects which formed the various excuses for its detailed manifestation were, one and all, taken from the mysteries of our holy faith. It may well be, then, that even amid the unseemly revelry which we have just been describing, the original signification of those rude symbols was not wholly lost to view. This seems all the more probable when we remember that in the times when these things occurred the lamp of faith burned so brightly that in spite of their barbarism, their grossness, and their superstition, they have ever since been emphasized as the ages of faith, in contradistinction to all others.

Take, for example, the *Festum Assinorum*, which, in its embryonic state, would seem to have been nothing more than a manifestation of the beautiful devotion to the crib of Bethlehem which we still practise at Christmas time. Who were its original institutors, when and where it was first practised—these are questions which, at the present day, it would be most difficult to determine; but the following anecdote may serve to teach us something of the spirit which, doubtless, animated them: and with it we will bring these reflections to a close. The little town of Greccio, in Umbria, is the scene of the story we are about to relate; its hero is Francis of Assisi, the gentle St. Francis, who, in the imaginative enthusiasm of his mystical piety, saw in all God's creatures his brethren and his friends. He who tells the tale is no other than his faithful disciple, the Seraphic Bonaventure.

It was the Christmas of the year 1223, barely three years before he was destined to *welcome his Sister Death*, that

Francis found himself at Greccio, and in order to arouse the good-folk of that town to keep the great festival with becoming fervour, he determined, having first obtained the permission of the Sovereign Pontiff, to make for them a representation of the stable at Bethlehem, where Christ was born. With his own hands he laid down the straw, and when he had made all things ready, he led thither an ox and an ass. To fully appreciate the beauty of this scene, it is important to bear in mind that St. Francis, like all great souls, was a sincere lover of nature; that to quote Goerrey, "between him and animals there was that confiding and frank intercourse which, as ancient traditions tell us, existed before the Fall."

St. Bonaventure then goes on to tell us how his spiritual father stood before the crib, weeping for very joy, and how after Mass he addressed the people, and spoke to them of the birth of that poor King, whom, in the tenderness of his heart, he loved to call the little Child of Bethlehem; and if we may credit the lectures of St. John de Greccio, a valiant knight, who afterwards for Christ's sake gave up the sword; a divine prodigy bore witness that Heaven was well pleased with what the saint had done; for he affirms that he saw a little child, of no earthly beauty, sleeping in the manger; and that blessed Father Francis took it into his arms, and, as if to awaken it, pressed it to his bosom.

The practice of associating animals with religious ceremonies has not entirely died out, even to the present day. In Mexico, the natives still make the wild denizens of the forest take part in the procession of Corpus Christi, by capturing them and tying them up along its route; we ourselves have seen sheep led in the Holy Blood Procession at Bruges; the lambs of St. Agnes are still blessed at Rome; and at the great Benedictine Abbey of Maredsous, than at which place the ceremonies of the Church are nowhere celebrated with greater decorum—the Paschal lamb decked with ribbons, and with the banner of the cross bound over its shoulders, is led up to the Abbatial throne during Mass on Holy Saturday, there to be blessed by the abbot and sprinkled with holy water, according to the rite provided in the Roman Missal.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.



## DEPORTATION OF THE IRISH TO THE WEST INDIES IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

### II.

THE forcible deportation of the Irish from their native country was not even then a new panacea for the evils caused by misgovernment. Chichester, half a century before, had suggested that "the children of O'Neill and O'Donnell should be taken to England and taught trades, that they might forget their fierceness and pride." Lord Cork, who had profited so largely by previous spoliations, and the name of whose son, Lord Broghill, is, as Mr. Prendergast truly remarks, always one of evil omen to the Irish, wrote in the beginning of the war of 1641 :—" Few or none that is a native of Ireland and of the Romish religion, but is not an assistant or well-wisher to this rebellion. His Majesty and the parliament have a fit opportunity for this treason to root the Popish part of the natives out of the kingdom, and to plant it with English Protestants; that measure alone could secure this kingdom to the crown of England, which it will never be so long as these Irish Papists have any land here, or are suffered to live." And to reduce his theory to practice, he had established a colony of English at Bandon; Cromwell found it "a fine sweet town without any admixture of Irish." In 1655 colonists being wanted for Jamaica, Cromwell wrote to his son Henry, then commanding the forces in Ireland, to engage fifteen hundred of the soldiers to go thither as planters, and to secure a thousand young Irish girls to be sent there also. He answered that there would be no difficulty, only that force must be used in taking them. He suggested that from fifteen hundred to two thousand boys of from 12 to 15 years of age should be added. "We could well spare them," he says, "and they might be of use to you: and who knows but it might be a means to make them Englishmen, I mean Christians."

The common notion is that the forcible deportation of the Irish took place only at the end of the war, *i.e.*, in 1653, and the years following. This is not quite true. That the great

majority deported were carried away then, we know; but we have proof that in the very beginning of the war, so early as 1642, very probably earlier, the number of Irish exiles in the West Indies was very considerable. In the beginning of that year Father O'Hartegan, S.J., had been sent by the Catholic Confederates, with the consent of his superiors, to the Court of France to ask for aid of men and materials of war for the Irish then in arms "for the faith, for the King's rights, and for their country." Among the Wadding Papers in the Franciscan Convent, Merchants'-quay, there is a letter which he wrote on the 25th of March, 1643, from Paris, to the General of the Society of Jesus:—

"I have received, through R. F. Jordan Forestiere, Procurator of the French Provincials at the Court, a petition from twenty thousand Irish whom persecution and evil times have forced into exile, and who are living in St. Christopher's and the neighbouring islands. Monsieur du Peon, Admiral of the French fleet stationed there, brought it over. He also joins in the request that two or more Irishmen of our Society should be sent there to instruct their countrymen, who are without pastors, and to administer the sacraments to them. I send a copy of the letter to F. W. Malone [he was then Superior of the Irish Mission of the Society] to show it to you, that he may treat with you about the help to be given to those souls in danger. I beg of your Reverence to send me there. It is in my favour that I shall soon have done all that I have been asked to do at this Court, that I am in good health, and that I have a complete knowledge of three languages, French, English, and Irish, all three commonly spoken in these parts, a great desire, through God's grace, for the salvation of souls, and an earnest wish to be sent on this or some such mission."

It is very probable that Father O'Hartegan's wish was gratified, and that he was sent to that Mission; not just then, however, for three years later, immediately after the battle of Banburb, we find him employed by Owen Roe O'Neill to bring to the Papal Legate Rinuccini, then in Limerick, the standards taken there from the Scotch under Monroe. As no further mention of him occurs in connection with public affairs in Ireland, the presumption is, that he was sent to the West Indies, and that he passed the rest of his life there labouring among his exiled countrymen. A Father Stritch, S.J., was sent to St. Christopher's, in 1650. In a

report to his superiors he says he had a congregation there of three thousand. It would have been very much larger, no doubt, but for the cruelties inflicted on the people to prevent their attendance.

What the number of these exiles was, it is impossible to say with anything like exactness. Sir William Petty, who wrote his *Political Anatomy* in 1672, says six thousand boys and women had been sold as slaves out of Ireland. M'Geoghegan gives their number as between fourteen thousand and twenty thousand. Father John Grace found twelve thousand there in 1666. Lingard cites a letter written in 1656, which states that sixty thousand up to that time had been transported to the Tobacco Islands; Bruodin, in fine, makes it as much as one hundred thousand.

Here is a brief *resumé* of some statements of contemporary writers regarding these who were deported. At the siege of Drogheda, Cromwell tell us, "some of the Irish had taken refuge in one of the towers of St. Peter's Church. When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head, every tenth man of the soldiers killed, and the rest shipped for the Barbadoes. The soldiers in the other tower were all spared (as to their lives only), and shipped likewise for the Barbadoes." In the "Declaration of the Irish Bishops" assembled at Clonmacnoise, bearing date December 14th, they speak of "the numbers already sent hence for the Tobacco Islands." There is, in the archives of the Franciscan Convent, Dublin, a manuscript headed "Relatio." It is a short account of the state of Ireland in the year 1651, written by one of the Order, very probably to Father Luke Wadding, then in Rome. In it we find the following:— "They (the English) have adopted a new plan. They have seized ninety-six priests and religious, and shut them up in the Castle of Carrickfergus, waiting to send them to the Island of Jamaica to work there as slaves." In 1653, the Government Commissioners contracted with two English merchants to supply to them two hundred and fifty women and three hundred men of the Irish nation, to be found within twenty miles of Cork, Youghal, Kinsale, Waterford, and Wexford. Lord Broghill undertook to supply that

number from the County of Cork alone. In the following year, the governors of some of the towns in Leinster had orders to arrest and deliver to three English merchants all wanderers, men and women as could not prove they had means of their own to maintain them, all children in hospitals and workhouses, all prisoners, to be transported to the West Indies."

The author of the *Description of Ireland in 1654*, says :— "The heretics, despairing of being ever able to alienate the Irish from the ancient faith, transport their children in ship fulls for sale to the Indian islands, that thus forsooth no remnant of the Irish may survive and now escape from the extermination of the nation." In 1655 the government published an Order in which it set down that during the four preceding years six thousand four hundred Irish had been sold to English dealers; and it tells how the people had been "enticed on board ship, women being thus forced from their husbands and children, and children from their parents." These are, no doubt, "the oppressions and abuse," spoken of in an order given below. The parliament had assigned Connaught for the habitation of the Irish, whither they should transplant before May 1st, 1654, under penalty of death if found on this side of the Shannon after that day. Many preferred death itself to leaving their homes. The West India islands had lately passed into the hands of the English. The death of so many would carry with it "somewhat of horror," to use Clarendon's words, and labour was needed in those islands. The result was that in 1656 the penalty of death in case of those who were found not to have transplanted was changed into transportation. Moreover, an Act was passed in this same year ordering that the children, grandchildren, brothers, nephews, uncles, and next pretended heirs of persons attainted living upon the common cost of people who were late tenants to or followers of the respective ancestors of such persons, should within the next six months remove to Connaught, and anyone found after that time in any of the three provinces should be transported to the English plantations in America for life. The governors of prisons were ordered



to convey their prisoners to Carrickfergus, there to be put on board such ship as should sail with the first opportunity for the Barbadoes. In July of this year, as we learn from M'Skimmen's *History of Carrickfergus*, "there were twenty-six Roman Catholic priests and schoolmasters confined in the castle there prior to their being transported to the Barbadoes."

Hardiman, in his *History of Galway*, states that Stubbers, who was about this time Governor of Galway, under pretence of taking up vagrants and idle persons, made frequent excursions by night with armed troops into the country, and seized upwards of a thousand people, often without discrimination of rank or condition, whom he transported to the West Indies, and had sold there as slaves. And the author of *Cambrensis Eversus*, which was published in 1662, tells us that "those who were appointed agents for the Indian trade used jocosely to say to the collectors of the revenue, that when the entire property of the Irish was extracted by the public charges of the State, and the whole juice squeezed out of the golden apples, then the rind of those apples, the wretched bodies of the Irish, should be bestowed on them to amass a fortune . . . Such was the conduct of the Indian factors, who first plundered our countrymen of their paternal property, and then nefariously sold them as slaves."

We will now give the extracts from the Council Books:—

"November, 1654. The Lord Deputy and Council give license to Robert Mouldsworth to transport vagrants to the English plantations in America; great oppressions and abuse having been formerly done and committed by colour and pretence of such like licenses, he is allowed to take out of the counties of Dublin, Kildare, Wicklow, Eastmeath, and Louth, not exceeding 200 persons delivered to him by Order in writing under two or more Justices of the peace.

"Thomas Lambert gets a like permission to transfer 200 out of Carlow, Kilkenny, Wexford, Waterford, and Tipperary.

"Dec. 19th. Hamberston Hurst gets a like permission for Cork, Limerick, and Kerry for the same number.

"January 24th, 1655. Morish Cleer, priest. Upon consideration had of M. C. priest, It is ordered that it be referred to the Governor of Waterford, for the time being, to take care that the

petitioner be shipt away with the first vessel that shall be bound for the Barbadoes, there to work for his livelihood. Provided he give security not to returne unto these three nations of England, Ireland, or Scotland, without special license from ye.

"February 21st. Upon reading the petition of James Tuit, priest, it is thought fit, and ordered that the Marshal in whose custody the petitioner is kept do take the Bolts (chains) off the petitioner, and that nevertheless he take special care for the securing of the petitioner in safe custody until there is an opportunity to ship him away to the Barbadoes.

"June 16th. Ordered that a warrant be drawne for the petitioner to receive five pounds for taking of the Priest within mentioned in pursuance of the declaration made in that behalf, provided that the Priest be sent to Galway to Col. Stubbers, who is to take care that the said priest with the other priest in that towne be sent to the Barbadoes by the 1st of July next.

"December, 10th. Mr. Walsh, to deliver one Shelton a priest, to Captain Coleman, that he may be transported unto the Barbadoes, or other the English plantations in America.

"January 18th, 1656. Ordered that the Keeper of the Gaol at Newgate, Dublin, do forthwith upon receipt hereof deliver or cause to be delivered unto Mr. Robert Molesworth, of Dublin, merchant (or unto such as he shall appoint to receive them), the bodies of Thomas Brackshaw, Robert Ledwick, Walter Poore, Andrew Casack, John Loxton, Benjamin Tiddlett, and John McGaltry, now in the custody of him the said Keeper of Newgate for felony; and the said Mr. Molesworth, having first paid what is due to the said Marshall for the said prisoners), is from thenceforth safely to keep the said persons at his own charge until he shall transport them for the Barbadoes or other the English Plantation Islands in America.

"The like order to the Keeper, Philip Peake, to deliver the body of Farrell Brady to Mr. Molesworth.

"July, 21st. The like order to the Keeper of Newgate, to deliver the bodies of Morgan Kinselah, William M'Morish, Patrick Doyle, and Hugh Doyle (now prisoners in his custody) to Mr. Molesworth.

"The like order to Marshall Peake, to deliver up bodies of Thomas Duff Byrne and James Hugh (now prisoners in his custody), to Mr. Molesworth.

"May 21st. Robert Molesworth and Thomas Boyd, merchants, pray to have out of such as shall be sentenced for transportation, and out of such as are now in prison, upon the account of being Vagrants, to the number of one thousand, to be transported to the English Plantations in America: It was ordered that the said T.B. and R.M., or either of them, are hereby authorized to carry out such persons of the Irish Nation and Popish religion as by the Declarations on that behalf are

transplantable into Connaught or Clare, and which have not transplanted accordingly, and shall be sentenced for the Barbadoes by the Commissioners : and also such persons as are now in prison on the account of being Vagrants, not exceeding in all the number of one thousand."

D. MURPHY, S.J.

(To be continued.)

## Theological Questions.

### I.

#### MASS IN PRIVATE HOUSES.

"REV. DEAR SIR,---Kindly answer the following in your next issue:—Do persons hearing Mass in private houses in this country fulfil the obligation of the Church? If not, are priests who celebrate in private houses obliged to hear a Mass on the same Sunday in a church?

"A CORRESPONDENT."

We believe that, from the custom of this country, people can satisfy the obligation of the Church by hearing Mass in a private house. Similarly, priests who celebrate Mass in private houses satisfy the obligation of hearing Mass. Priests, however, should attend to the following law of the Maynooth Synod:—"Missae post meridian non celebrentur, nec in aedibus privatis nisi de speciali et expressa Episcopi licentia."<sup>1</sup> We are not required by the terms of our correspondent's letter to discuss the general question, whether an episcopal law can resuscitate and set up in binding force a law of the Church which had fallen into disuse in some particular country. For the Maynooth statutes do not forbid the *hearing* of Mass in private houses. They cannot, therefore, resuscitate the general law, which requires that Mass should be heard on Sundays or holidays in a church or public oratory. And as to the celebration of Mass in private houses, it is prohibited only in a qualified

<sup>1</sup> Page 80, n. 64.

way; "nisi de speciali et expressa Episcopi licentia." Bishops, too, continue to give this "licentia." And as they cannot dispense in the common law of the Church, we may assume that the prohibition to say Mass in private houses may still be regarded in this country as a matter of merely local legislation.

## II.

### THE ORIGINAL MYSTERIES OF RELIGION.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—May I ask you, to say in the next number of the I. E. RECORD, whether 'The Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of our Saviour,' constitute four or five principal mysteries?"

"My own idea is that the Unity and Trinity comprise one, as there is nothing mysterious in there being only one God, considering that unity is a characteristic of various things in nature; but that the mystery is contained in the union of the Trinity with the Unity.

"My attention was drawn to the matter by hearing the diocesan examiner ask the children, some time ago, to name the *five* principal mysteries.

"PRAECEPTOR."

Our respected correspondent is quite right in believing that the Unity and Trinity of God do not constitute two mysteries, but only one. There is nothing mysterious in the idea of *one* divine nature. But that this one divine nature should be common to Three Persons; and that the Three Persons, while really identical with the nature, should be really distinct from one another, this is a mystery. Here we must humbly bow our intellects, and believe what we cannot comprehend. Nor, however, is our belief irrational. Our own natural reason can prove, from the contemplation of the physical world, that there is a Supreme Being—God. Even pagans will admit that God cannot deceive or be deceived. Hence, if God, whose existence reason itself demonstrates, speaks to us, and reveals some truth to us, we have the highest possible motive for asserting to that truth. It is not considered irrational to believe on the



authority of a professional astronomer, or geologist, or microscopist, &c. ; and why then should it be considered irrational to believe in the Trinity and the other mysteries of religion, when their existence and truth are vouched for by the authority of the infallible God, who can neither deceive others nor be deceived Himself?

The Incarnation, too, is a great mystery, and in striking contrast with the Trinity. The Trinity implies Three Persons in one nature; while the Incarnation implies two distinct natures but one Person. But, if we abstract from the fundamental mystery of the Incarnation, a God becoming incarnate to redeem and save us, the death and resurrection of our Saviour can scarcely be regarded as separate and distinct *mysteries*. The Death of Christ was undoubtedly a great mystery of love; but the physical separation of His body and soul was not a mystery of nature. As Christ assumed a human nature like ours, with all those general defects, which were not incompatible with the character of the God-Man, death was as natural to Him as hunger, thirst, cold, heat, fatigue, exhaustion, &c. ; but these, surely, were not *mysteries*. And as to the Resurrection, if we speak of it in relation to our redemption—in which sense St. Paul writes: “And if Christ be not risen again your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins”<sup>1</sup>—it can scarcely be regarded as a mystery separate and distinct from the fundamental mystery of the Incarnation; and if we speak of it as the physical reunion of soul and body, it is not a mystery; but, as in the raising to life of Lazarus, the act by which the Incarnate Word reunited His own soul and body, and arose from the dead, should be called a *miracle* rather than a *mystery*.

Nevertheless, those important truths, which are intimately connected with the revealed mysteries, and which must be explicitly known and believed, at least by reason of a divine precept, are sometimes themselves called *mysteries*.

D. COGHLAN.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor., xv. 17.

## Liturgy.

---

EXPOSITION OF THE INSIGNIA, DRESS, AND PRIVILEGES OF  
DOMESTIC AND OTHER PRELATES WHO ARE NOT BISHOPS.<sup>1</sup>

1. Plures super Praelatorum Insignium usu et abusu querelas audivimus, sive ab Episcopis Dioecesanis, sive a multis ex ecclesiasticis in Urbe degentibus. In ultimo Ephemeridum numero quaedam eodem super negotio Dubia resolvimus, sed breviori calamo: quod forte, et adin. Rev. Inquirenti, et aliis quorum interest, haud plene arrisit; sed necessitas id tulit. Impræsentī, quantum licet, sermonem ex professo instituimus hac de materia, ut quid pro Praelati nomine intelligatur, et quot illorum recenseantur species, simulque quorum iidem Insignium usu gaudeant, ac quibus in casibus, innotescat. Haud parvi nec facilis momenti negotium; nihilominus ipsum aggredimur, non quidem ecclesiasticæ, si forte detur, ambitioni, sed iustitiæ potius ac veritati ab omnibus, maxime Sacerdotibus adamandis, satisfacturi.

2. Studio de Praelatis, qui Episcopis sunt inferiores, disserendum nobis tantummodo proposuimus. Purpurati namque Patres, sacrique Antistites, tantam Ecclesiæ Dei excellentia sunt præditi, ut illos tanquam Pontificis constituentes senatum, hos tanquam Ecclesiæ divinæ rectores, maxime ab aliis, ad Insignia quod spectat, discriminari, merito iudicetur ab omnibus. Sublimissima nihilominus Summi Pontificis dignitas, quæ magis nulla eminet in terris, exigit, ut præter Cardinales et Episcopos, alii non desint in Ecclesiâ viri, quos sibi Pontifex in servitium eligat: ut gloria et splendore circumdatus Deum, cuius gerit vices, repræsentare digne valeat. Pontificiam dignitatem præterea negotiorum multiplicitas sequitur et gravitas, quæ fert necessitas ut aliis committantur. Hi autem omnes, seu quod bene de Ecclesiâ plus minusve meriti, seu quod

<sup>1</sup> Taken from the *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, Romæ.

Christi Vicario proximius quam reliqui accedunt, omnino congruit, ut ab aliis distinguantur. Haec vero distinctio semper in aliquibus externis Insignibus consistit, praeter reliqua, quibus decorati illi esse possunt, privilegia, de quibus nobis non est disserendum.

3. Inter Ecclesiae viros illi qui Pontifici plus minusve proxime in servitio accedentes, ab aliis discriminantur, nonnulli sunt nuncupanturque Praelati. Silemus de communi nominis huiusce significatione; siquidem neminem latet, Episcopos, Purpuratos Patres ipsunque Summum Pontificem sub eadem communi appellatione optimo iure, et ante omnes contineri. Sed, hoc nominali praetermisso sensu, sub alio nunc nomen istud accipimus, qui peculiaris est, et quodammodo ex conventionem ortus. Praelatus, definiri ille potest, qui inferior Episcopo dignitate, aliis tamen Presbyteris excellit in servitium Pontificis. Praelati sunt plures, aliique aliis digniores. Primi, qui ceteris supereminent, quatuor enumerantur: (a) Vice-Camerarius S. R. E. italice *Vice-camerlengo*: (b) Auditor Rev. Camerae Apostolicae: (c) Praefectus aerario Rev. Camerae Apostolicae, seu *Tesoriere*: (d) Praefectus Sacris Palatiis Apostolicis, quod italice dicimus *Maggiordomo*. Eiusmodi quatuor officia in maximo constituunt gradu Praelatos, quibus illa sunt credita. Ut plurimum, expleto munere, unusquisque ex illis ad Cardinalitiam evehitur Dignitatem a Summo Pontifice, hinc et officia dicuntur Cardinalitia.

Vice-Camerarius praecedat quibuscunque aliis Ministris in Pontificia Capella. Mantelletum induit violaceam et Rocchettum, quod olim<sup>1</sup> detectum in civilibus publice deferbat. Ante Pontificem sistit in solemnibus, quae ab Illo functiones persolvuntur, tanquam cuique summi Antistitis nutui obedire paratus.

Auditor Camerae Apostolicae, veluti primas inter Praelatos obtinet, qui uti Vice-Camerarius nec non Praefectus aerario, et alter qui Palatiis Apostolicis praeficitur, praeter

<sup>1</sup> Quando nempe Vice-Camerarii officio alterum Gubernatoris erat annexum, ut utrumque uni eidemque committeretur Praelato, antequam degeneres nati re temporali expoliarent Patrem (V. *Falaschi, La Gerarch. Ecclesiast.*, pag. 43).

vestem omnium Praelatorum propriam, seu violacei coloris talarem, cum respectiva zona, et cauda, eiusdemque coloris Mantelletam, in pileo gestare lemniscos valet coloris rubei. Quibus olim et equi exornabantur in capite, quando rheda utebantur, ad cuius latus umbella erat affixa et plicata rubei coloris, more purpuratorum Patrum. Hinc vulgaris erat, et est, horum quatuor Praelatorum denominatio: Praelati a flocculis *Praelati dei fiocchetti*.

Proxime praelatis accedit Praelatus, Cubiculo Praepositus, *Maestro di Camera*: qui una cum Praefecto Palatii Apostolicis, Auditore Sanctitatis Suae, Sacrique Palatii Apostolici Magistro, illos constituunt, qui Praelati Palatini nuncupantur, quod ad domum Pontificiam pertineant; sed de his suo loco dicendum.

4. Inter S. R. E. Praelatos praecipuum obtinent locum Protonotarii Apostolici: ex quibus, alii *participantes* sunt, alii vero *ad instar*, scilicet participantium, alii simpliciter *titulares*: sit primo de participantibus.

Protonotarii participantes olim fuerunt septem, Sixtus V. ad duodecim auxit: impraesentiarum septem<sup>1</sup> in *Hierarchia Catholica* commemorantur, et Collegium peculiare constituunt, honorificis privilegiis a Summis Pontificibus condecoratum, quae nihilominus silemus, cum propositum nostrum non attingant. Insignia, quibus uti possunt in publicis functionibus, haec sunt: Talaris vestis cum cauda in solis Pontificalibus explicanda, Mantelletta item violacei coloris, Rocchettum, quod eadem Mantelletta cooperiat oportet. In pileo funiculos gestare possunt vel lemniscos violacei coloris, floccosque roseos, sicuti semper in communi pileo, quo utuntur, floccum rosaceum. In Cappella pontificia cappis utuntur Protonotarii quemadmodum alii Prelatii, non tamen superpelliceo super Rocchettum. Praecedentiam, uti tales, habent nunc super reliquos Praelatos, superius nominatis quatuor exceptis, episcopali dignitate non insignitos; imo quandoque, uti in consistoriis publicis, sicut et antiquitus in solemnibus equitationibus, super eosdem Episcopos, praecedentia gaudent, cum proximiores quatuor

<sup>1</sup> Pius Papa IX per Breve d. an. 1853 ad pristinum numerum septenum Protonotarios redegit (*Giornale Los Congr. Rom.*).



ex iis solio pontificio assistant. De palmatoria in Missis privatis et Canone, sicut de illa in sacris actibus, in quibus adhiberi solet ab Episcopis, ac de ipsius annuli usu non est quaestio. Protonotarius namque participans, si Presbyter quidem, iure Pontificalium gaudet, quae potest agere in omnibus Ecclesiis, etiam cathedralibus, absque consensu Praesulum, nisi hi praesentes fuerint, tunc enim requiritur. Porro animadvertendum, Protonotarios participantes, esse Summi Pontificis familiares declaratos, ac Praelatos domesticos aeque principaliter, ut illi sunt, qui actu personae ipsius Pontificis assistant; imo ab Ordinariorum iurisdictione exempti, Sedis Apostolicae dominium et potestatem dumtaxat agnoscunt.

Notandum nihilominus, privilegium Pontificalium esse quoad locum coarctatum, ut non ubique eo uti Protonotarii participantes valeant. Itaque excipitur expresse tamquam exceptionis locus alma Urbs, in qua Curia Romana residet, vel alia, si in ea Curia eadem resideret. Quod de Pontificalium usu diximus, non est ad privatam Missam extendendum: adeo ut etiam Romae iisdem Protonotariis vere liceat nonnullis Insignibus uti. Hinc privatam facientes Missam annulum deferre possunt cum gemma, palmatoriam et Canonem: ad altare, Episcoporum more, paramenta sumere, iisque se induere in plano ante altare, ibique praeparare se ad Missam super pulvinari cum strato, et gratiarum actionem persolvere. Quod tamen ut licite ac decore fiat, rem divinam Protonotarii Apostolici facturi, accedere debent ad altare praelatio habitu induti, quemadmodum Episcopi.

5. Praelatis istis accedunt alii, qui Protonotarii quoque sunt, non tamen participantes, sed communiter appellantur *ad instar participantium*. Eiusmodi Protonotarii *ad instar* a Pontifice fiunt, et inter Praelatos domesticos eo ipso accensentur. Vestibus praelatiis et ipsi uti valent in sacris functionibus, nempe talari veste caudata cum fascia, et Mantelletta violacei coloris, subtus quam induere possunt Rochettum. Etiamsi privatim incedant, usum habent collaris et caligarum violacei coloris, vestis talaris nigrae cum fimbriis globulisque rosaceis, zonae ad lumbos pariter violaceae, pallii eiusdem coloris, et pilei cum vitta serica coloris

rubri. Si sint Canonici, et adesse velint in choro, quod non licet, praelatitia veste induti, omnes alios Canonicos et etiam Praelatos praecedunt, quibus Pontificalium privilegium non competit. Vicarii vero generales aut capitulares, Collegium Canonorum, et Abbates super Protonotarios ad instar praecedentia fruuntur. Item tanquam Praelati duplici ductu incensantur, caput cruci inclinant non genuflectunt, etsi Canonici sint tantum Collegiatae. Nihilominus convenientius habitum canonicalem gestant, coloris tamen violacei vestis talaris esse potest; et locum Canonici proprium tunc occupare debent: secus, Praelati quidem apparendi ius habent sed quotidianas distributiones amittunt.

Usu Pontificalium extra Urbem gaudent, sed in eodem usu ab Episcopi loci facultate dependent: qui eam tribuere potest quoties et pro quibus solemnitatibus voluerit. In casu ad Ecclesiam celebraturi, privatim debent accedere, sine ullo prorsus comitatu, quin associari se sinant a clero, nec lustrali aqua populum aspergant, nec manu fidelibus benedicant. In Altari adesse nequit septimum candelabrum: vestes induere debent in sacrario, sedere in scamno communi cum ministris, haud in faldistorio: nec baculum habere, nec palmatoriam, neque Canonem, neque Assistentem Presbyterum: manus lavant, uti simplices Sacerdotes, tantum post offertorium, non *pax vobis* dici ab eis potest, sed *Dominus vobiscum*, nec trina benedictio impertiri, sed unica, in fine Missae. Ornamenta iis in Pontificalibus permissa sunt: caligae et sandalia ex serico, nullo cum auri vel argenti ornamento, item simplices ex serico chirothecae, omni ornatu hyggii operis excluso, dalmatica, tunicella, amulus cum unica gemma, crux pectoralis sine ullis gemmis, et cum cordula tantum serica violacea, mitra simplici ex tela alba, cum lacinis sericis coloris rubri, pileolum nigrum sub mitra, solum, adhibendum. Quae ornamenta ipsis sunt prohibita in Missis defunctorum, et in quibuscumque aliis functionibus, nisi forte praecedant aut subsequantur immediate Missam Pontificalem, et tunc depositis semper chirothecis, dalmatica et tunicella.

Ad Missam privatam quod spectat, Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar, qui extra Urbem degunt, nullo prorsus

privilegio gaudent, sub quocumque respectu, in eaque facienda equiparantur omnino simplicibus Presbyteris. Qui vero eiusmodi Protonotarii in urbe versantur, utpote usum Pontificalium non habentes, possunt, modo induti praelatitia veste, in Missis privatis se praeparare et gratiarum actionem persolvere ante altare, super genuflexorio parvo, sine strato, cum pulvinaribus tamen, altero sub genibus, altero sub brachiis. Paramenta possunt ex eodem altari sumere et induere, palmatoria uti, et capellanum etiam habere Presbyterum, ut folia Missalis evolvat. In reliquis, cum simplicibus Sacerdotibus Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar convenire debent.

Ea tantum sunt privilegia, quibus gaudent huiusmodi Praelati, seu Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar, et qui aliis, praeter memorata, privilegiis et iuribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso Protonotariatus honore privatos se sciant.<sup>1</sup>

6. Hic recensebimus Praelatos ad Palatium Apostolicum pertinentes, vulgo nuncupatos *palatini*. Praeter Praelatum Palatii Apostolicis praefectum, de quo iam diximus, alii sunt, nempe Cubiculo Praepositus Sanctitatis Suae, eiusdem Sanctitatis Suae Auditor, qui ut plurimum in Episcopali ordine constitutus est, et Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici, qui ex Ordine desumitur PP. Praedicatorum S. Dominici, iuxta privilegium, quod dicto Ordini Honorius III concessit.

Praefatos sequuntur Cubicularii secreti participantes, uti Magister a privatis largitionibus Pontificis (*Elemosiniere segreto*), qui ordinario Episcopali dignitate fulget, Secretarius Brevium ad Principes, Secretarius Cistac, Subdatarius, et Secretarius Epistolarum latinarum. Recenseri hic possunt, quin tamen inter Praelatos sint adscripti, quatuor alii, ex quibus primus *Pincerna*, alter *Secretarius legationis*, tertius *vestiarii Custos* nuncupatur: quartus sine speciali titulo. Familiae quoque Pontificiae adscribitur alius Praelatus, Episcopus tamen, qui ex Ordine S. Augustini seligitur, ab aetate Nicolai IV Pontificis, estque Sacri Palatii Aposto-

<sup>1</sup> Eadem, circa Pontificalium usum Missaeque privatam, quae de Protonotariis ad instar dicta sunt, valent etiam pro reliquis Curiae Romanae Praelatis, qui ex indulto Pontificalium usu gaudent.

lici Parochus, et sub communi appellatione venit, *Sacrista* Sanctitatis Suae. Qui de familia Pontificia sunt, et ratione officii non sunt Praelati, alicui nihilominus Praelatorum Collegio esse possunt adscripti: quod si comprobetur, consuetis fruuntur Insignibus et privilegiis, quibus Collegium ad quod pertinent, decoratur.

Ad Praelatos quoque pertinent Romanae Curiae immo et praecipue, ii omnes, qui Tribunal Sacrae Rotae efformant, et dicuntur *Praelati Auditores*. Sixtus IV ad duodenarium hos redegit numerum: in *Hierarchia Catholica* septem modo enumerantur. Item Praelaticum Collegium constituunt, qui ad Rev. Cameram Apostolicam pertinet et *Praelati clerici de Camera* appellantur. Duodecim quondam numero erant, ad septimum eorum redegit numerum Eugenius IV, nec maiori nunc numero in *Hierarchia Catholica* leguntur inscripti. Tertium extat Praelatorum Collegium, quod a *Signatura Papali Iustitiae* nuncupatur. Ex his Prelatis, alii *Rotales* dicuntur, alii *Referendarii*. Aliud denique institutum fuit Collegium, Praelatique ad illum pertinentes, *Abbrecciatores Pauci majoris* nuncupantur. Numerus eorum ex institutione Pii Papae II, quam confirmavit renovavitque Sixtus IV, quodenus est: quatuor de numero, octo supernumerarii sunt.

7. Praeter Praelatos domesticos, qui quatuor collegia constituunt, quae recensimus, alii quoque dantur eodem nomine appellati, qui uti individua hoc condecorantur honore, et nullum collegium efformant, vere tamen Praelati sunt, et uti tales nonnullis Insignibus fruuntur. Itaque primo Praelatus Domesticus habitu praelaticum gaudet, nempe talari veste caudata coloris violacei, cum ornatibus in illius numerum extremitatibus, ac fimbriis, asulis et globalis rubei coloris, item cum zona violacea, quae sericos floccos in extremitatibus habet. Super talari veste utitur Praelatus domesticus Mantelletto violacea, cum fimbriis pariter eiusdem violacei coloris. Item praefatae vesti iure adduntur eiusdem violacei coloris tibialia. Non fruitur usu cappae praelaticae, neque Rocchetti, quod per Breve speciale conceditur. In Missis sive solemnibus sive privatis, aliisque functionibus nulla gaudet distinctione Praelatus Domesticus



uti talis, ut palmatoria nequeat uti,<sup>1</sup> nec canone, annulo, cruce pectorali, aut quovis alio ornamento Episcoporum proprio, Abbatum, aliorumve Praelatorum ad aliquod collegium pertinentium.

In civilibus Praelatus Domesticus veste talari nigra uti potest cum consuetis rubeis ornatibus, et zona violacei coloris, tibialibus pariter, pallio, atque etiam flocco in pileo nigro, omnia eiusdem coloris violacei.

Si Praelatus Domesticus sit Canonicus, eadem pro ipso vim habent, quae statuta sunt pro Protonotariis ad instar participantium, seu circa habitum praelatitium, seu circa amissionem distributionum, seu circa praecedentias.

8. Sed iam de Protonotariis dicendum, qui neque participantibus sunt, neque ad instar participantium, sed mere *titulares* aut *honorarii* vocantur.<sup>2</sup> De iis animadvertendum primo est, non dari collegium, etsi plures simul convenerint; habitu nihilominus praelatio, ad formam quod attinet, uti ipsi possunt, quando non degant ubi adsit Summus Pontifex. Privilegium itaque habent gestandi vestem talarem et mantelletum, non tamen violacei, sed nigri coloris. In ecclesiasticis functionibus subter Mantelletum Rocheto utuntur. Nulla his Protonotariis Insignia competunt violacei coloris, uti focale, tibialia, flocculi in pileo etc. quae omnia nigri tantum coloris esse debent. Si ad Collegium aliquod Canonicorum pertineant eiusmodi protonotarii servandum, quod de aliis Protonotariis ad instar, Praelatisque domesticis dictum est. Nulla, etsi habitu praelatio induti, praecedentia gaudent super Praelatos Romanae Curiae, Vicarios

<sup>1</sup> Romae, docuerunt Ephemerides (num. 6 1893 pag. 357, Dub VIII, 2) usus viget, ut Praelati domestici palmatoria utantur. Sed fortasse id agunt quia ad aliquod etiam Collegium pertinent Praelatitium. Quidquid sit, iure inspecto, Praelatis Domesticis *per se* palmatoria non competit.

<sup>2</sup> Antiquiores scriptores, qui verba faciunt de Protonotariis Apostolicis, nonnisi duplicem eorum ordinem videntur admittere, nempe Protonotarios Participantes, et alios quos honorarios aut titulares dicunt. Nihilominus indubie retinendum, triplicem nunc esse Protonotariorum ordinem, videlicet, participantium, ad instar participantium, et titularium seu honorariorum. Ad primum qui potior est, participantibus, ad alterum qui inferior est, ad instar participantium, ad tertium ordinem infimum titulares pertinent. Primi et alteri collegium efformant, nullum tertii, sicuti simplices Praelati Domestici, quibus tamen etiam inferiores sunt Protonotarii titulares.

Generales aut Capitulares, super Abbates, et Capitulum: bene vero super alios clericos aut Presbyteros simplices, sicuti super singulos Canonicos.

In Missa distinguì non possunt a simplicibus Presbyteris: adeo ut in sacrario teneantur paramenta induere, unum tantum habere ministrum in privata, per se deferre calicem, folia Missalis vertere, nullumque aliud habere signum distinctionis amuli, pileoli, palmatoriae etc. etc. Eis nihilominus licet Cruci inclinationem pro genuflexione facere, uti ius habent Cathedralium Ecclesiarum Canonici.

9. Alii non desunt, praeter recensitos, quos Praelatorum nomine et honore sunt insigniti, uti Abbates, atque etiam Canonici trium Basilicarum Urbis, S. Petri ad Vaticanum, S. Ioannis ad Lateranum, S. Mariae ad praesepe. De utrisque siluimus: de illis, quia fere unusquisque Abbas peculiaribus in loco privilegiis gaudet: de istis, quia exceptis Insignibus, omnibus ii gaudent privilegiis Praelatorum; et Pius Papae IX de Protonotariis Apostolicis ad instar loquens, illorum privilegia intacta reliquit.

Alii quoque sunt, qui reliquis simplicibus Presbyteris veluti praelati considerantur, quod familiares intimi Summi Pontificis sint electi, uti nonnulli ex Cubiculariis secretis, supranumerarii, Cubicularii honorarii, Cappellani secreti, superanumerarii et honorarii. De his innuere satis sit, latiori sensu, haud severiori, eos esse Praelatos. Induunt tamen in sacris functionibus vestem talarem violaceam cum fascia eiusdem coloris, et super ea pallium oblongum (vulgo *Mantellone*) pariter violaceum. Si quis ex illis fuerit Canonicus, nullum habet ius super alios Collegas, excepta violacea veste, qua uti poterit in functionibus, quin, tamen ullam sibi praecedentiam arrogare aut exigere valeat. Tibialia violacea, unica excepta occasione, qua Pontifici proficiscenti vel rusticanti inservit, adhibere nequit. Iure non gaudet deferendi flocculum violaceum vel rubeum in pileo. Uti nequit palmatoria et canone, et quocumque alio signo honorifico, sive in privata sive in solemniiori Missa.

*Nota.* Hucusque dicta plane conformia sunt documentis, omni exceptione superioribus: qualia sunt: *La Gerarchia Ecclesiastica dell'Abate Falaschi*: *La Gerarchia Cattolica*

*per l'anno 1893: Andreucci, De Protonotariis Apostolicis: Martinucci, Manuale Caceremoniarum etc.* item varia ea super materia Decreta, quae in Collectione Gardelliniana prostant, uti Decr. 4545, et alia similia, maxime Constitutiones Pii Papae VII, et Pii Papae IX.

## Notices of Books.

THE LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES, C.P. By the Rev. Father Austin, C.P. Dublin: Sealy, Bryers, & Walker.

THIS is a short, but very interesting biography. It reveals to the public the life of a man of wonderful sanctity. It gives us a glimpse of his career through all its principal stages, from his birth at Munster-Geleen, in Limburg, on the 11th of December, 1821, to his death at Mount Argus, on the 5th of January, in the present year. It is, indeed, a most edifying life, a constant record of struggles made and of victories won in the combat of the spirit against the world and its attendants. Father Charles was an ascetic of the St. Francis type, taking upon himself the punishment of others, and full of compassion, tenderness, and helpful sympathy for all who suffered or went astray. When one has read the account of his early life, and his progress in advancing years, he is not surprised at the fame acquired by this heavenly man in later years. Father Austin gives us a brief list of what appears to be nothing short of miraculous cures attributed to the interventions and prayers of Father Charles. But he adds:—

“No just idea can be conveyed of the extent of his charitable labours among the people. All classes of society, the great as well as the lowly, sought his assistance in their difficulties, doubts, and trials. When disease baffled professional skill—when peculiar cases, connected with the guidance of souls, were to be dealt with—when some terrible calamity brought ruin and disaster to families, and no earthly hope remained, recourse was had to Father Charles, which frequently astonished those who placed their faith in the efficacy of his aid. In every province and county in Ireland, in many cities and towns in England, even in America and Australia, there are many persons to be found who have reasons to be grateful to the servant of God for the favours which he obtained for them, and for the wisdom and foresight with which he directed them when they sought his advice.”

In the preface and introduction, both ably written, Father Austin shows how the supernatural remains as far removed as ever from the grasp of science: and how, even in the midst of vaunts and boastings of modern scientists, wonders occur around them which they are impotent to explain. We are sure this biography will have a wide circulation amongst the former clients of Father Charles, and the friends of Mount Argus; but we trust it may also find its way into the hands of the general public, and be carefully read.

J. F. H.

THE HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE DIOCESE OF KILMACDUAGH. By the Very Rev. Jerome Fahey, D.D., V.G. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS most valuable contribution to Irish ecclesiastical history reflects the highest credit on its venerated author. He has filled a large and portly volume with the records of one small diocese, and nobody who reads his work will consider that he has inserted anything in its pages which is not well worthy of permanent preservation. Local histories are often not as local as might be expected, but include a good deal of general history, which has very little connection with the matter under treatment. It fills space, and affords the author scope for some pages of good writing. It is tempting, no doubt, to diverge in this way; but, on the whole, Dr. Fahey has resisted the temptation. His matter all through has the genuine local colour. It is full of events that are not to be found in the ordinary historical books, and contains a great many records of interest to the inhabitants of the locality, which were scattered in sources inaccessible to the general reader. The painstaking and detailed account which Dr. Fahey gives of several periods makes his narrative somewhat dry to an outsider. That is only natural. But when he deals with matters of more general interest, his style is vivid and attractive. His sketch, for instance, of the character of Fitz Adelin de Burgo could scarcely be better done. Being only by accident at Maynooth, and writing hurriedly in the midst of the holidays, we cannot dwell further at present on this valuable work. Through respect towards its venerated author, we did not wish to delay a notice of it for another month or two. We cannot refrain, however, from wishing it a very hearty success, and congratulating Dr. Fahey on the splendid result of his labours.

J. F. H.



LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, AND POLITICAL VIEWS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Selected from his Works by Henry F. Brownson. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, 1893.

THE year 1845 is remarkable for two conversions to the Catholic faith—that of Newman in England, and Brownson in America. Orestes Augustine Brownson was in many respects like Newman. Both realized Carlyle's first condition of greatness, in that they were profoundly sincere. Brownson was a free-thinking philosopher, while Newman was trying to satisfy himself with Protestant theology. Both remained unsatisfied until they entered the one true fold, and henceforth both devoted their talents to the defence of Catholic truth. Brownson remained a layman, but was not less zealous than his great English contemporary in his efforts to convert his erring brethren. Nor are there wanting in his writings the elegance of diction, the solidity, the earnestness, and the learning which characterise the works of Newman. It is a pity that the editor of the book which we have been asked to review, did not prefix a short life of the author of these views for the benefit of the rising generation. Such a chapter would certainly not be the least interesting part of the book. We ought, however, be thankful for what we have got, namely, a most seasonable book in this age of worldliness and of indifference to forms of religion. The views are ranged under the following heads—literature, education, the sciences, the United States, political economy, civil and religious liberty, philosophy and philosophy of the supernatural.

A few extracts from those under the heading "Education" will indicate the directness and uncompromising character of Brownson's views. Under the sub-heading, "The Religious Difficulty"<sup>1</sup> we read:—"Catholicity must be taught as a whole in its unity and its integrity, or it is not taught at all. It must everywhere be all or be nothing." Farther on:—<sup>2</sup>

"We value education, and even universal education—which overlooks no class or child, however rich or however poor, however honoured or however despised—as highly as any of our countrymen do or can; but we value no education that is divorced from religion and from religious culture. Religion is the supreme law, the one thing to be lived for; and all in life, individual or

<sup>1</sup> Page 44

<sup>2</sup> Page 46.

social, civil or political, should be subordinated to it, and esteemed only as means to the eternal end, for which man was created and exists."

Under the sub-heading, "The State has no right to Educate," he holds, that while it may be the business of the State to maintain schools, it is the right and duty of the Church to educate.

"We deny, of course, as Catholics, the right of the civil government to educate, for education is a function of the spiritual society, as much as preaching and the administration of the sacrament; but we do not deny to the State the right to establish and maintain public schools. . . . It is said, however, that the State needs education for its own protection, and to promote the public good, or the good of the community, both of which are legitimate ends of its institution. What the State needs in relation to its legitimate ends, or the ends for which it was instituted, it has the right to ordain and control. This is the argument by which all public education by the State is defended. But it involves an assumption which is not admissible. The State having no religious or spiritual function, can give only secular education, and secular education is not enough for the State's own protection or its promotion of the public good. Purely secular education, or education divorced from religion, endangers the safety of the State, and the peace and security of the community, instead of protecting and insuring them."<sup>1</sup>

We might, if space permitted, give more interesting and eloquent extracts from other parts of the book. The complete works of Brownson number twenty volumes, and are beyond the reach of the multitude. Those, however, who wish to know the leading views on important subjects of a great man and a thorough Catholic, will find them in this small volume, which is neatly and carefully printed, and sold at a popular price.

T. P. G.

A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND. By P. W. Joyce, LL.D., M.R.I.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS is the first volume of Dr. Joyce's new *History of Ireland*. We cannot at present do more than announce its publication. We have not had time to examine it carefully. But from a cursory glance over the volume, it seems to us most successful. We are even confident that it will be found a great improvement on the works which have hitherto dealt with the same difficult

subject. It is not, and does not purport to be, an exhaustive history. It is a compendium ; and, as such, is clear, terse, and didactic. It is also very well arranged. The author was well inspired in giving in the beginning of his work, without entering into unnecessary detail, some account of the Irish language and literature, of the early ecclesiastical and religious writings, annals, histories, genealogies, historical and romantic tables. The Brehon laws are clearly and successfully treated in five short chapters. About twenty pages are devoted to the subject of early Irish music, architecture, and various customs. Then begins the history, properly so called. Dr. Joyce does not discourage or confuse his reader by entering too minutely into the genealogy of the ancient races and pagan kings of Ireland. He treats the whole subject in one short chapter, for which the ordinary reader of history will feel duly grateful to him. This first volume brings the history down to the reign of James II. We are glad to learn that the second volume is in course of preparation. We imagine that Dr. Joyce's work, when completed, will put all other compendiums of Irish history out of the field.

J. F. H.

#### ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPELS OF THE SUNDAYS OF THE YEAR.

From the Italian of Angelo Cagnola. By Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D., Author of "Notes on Ingersoll," "Tactics of Infidels," &c. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Brothers. 1892.

THIS book will be found useful by priests whose duty it is to explain those Gospels to the people. The title explains exactly the scope of the work. It does not contain a critical commentary of each Gospel. There are no directions given as to the subject which the preacher ought to select. One will not find in it a plan of a sermon on any subject naturally associated with the Gospel of the Sunday. Following the text of each Gospel, there is a short analysis of it in the catechetical form. The following is a portion of the analysis which is given of the Gospel of the Second Sunday after Epiphany :—

" Q. Is it not strange that Jesus and Mary were invited to a wedding feast ?

" A. No. Because it is said that the husband was Simon the son of Cleophas, the brother of St. Joseph, and therefore nephew of the Blessed Virgin, and cousin, according to law, of Jesus Christ. Besides, at the feast there were no improprieties or over

indulgence, which so often dishonours the tables of many Christians, to be feared. And lastly, Jesus Christ, as St. John Chrysostom tells us, wished to give to the world a useful lesson.

“Q. What was this lesson?”

“A. When at the wedding Jesus took occasion to manifest His divine power, by which those present were led to recognise in Him the expected Messiah. Besides, he prepared a condemnation of those heretics who taught that matrimony was the work of the Devil. And lastly, he wished to teach us that we should not refuse to contribute, when we are able, to the innocent enjoyment of our friends: for in this way the bond of peace and Christian friendship is preserved.

“Q. Why did Mary take such great interest when she knew that there was no more wine?”

“A. St. Bernard tells us that she is truly the Mother of Mercy. She foresaw and felt the shame and confusion of the poor husband and wife when the wine would give out before the feast was over . . . Oh, if all Christians had equal solicitude to spare their neighbours shame and confusion. But too frequently the confusion of others is a triumph and a joy to many egoists who are always talking about charity without knowing what it is.”

We give this passage merely as an example of the style of treatment, and not for the purpose of calling attention to the obviously careless revision of his work by the translator. Literary flaws do not mar the usefulness of such a book as this. Although in his Analysis of this Gospel the author does not go into the question of the interpretation of the words “Woman what is that to Me and to thee?” in it, and through the work generally, he gives all the information that is necessary for simple and practical preaching. If he does not give plans of sermons on special subjects, he supplies ample and apt material for the composition of homilies. It is just the book for a priest who is anxious to write his own sermons, but who wants a handy, practical, and safe explanation of the Gospels. The book is very neatly got up, and would be worthy of a place even in an ornamental library.

T. P. G.

BIRTHDAY SOUVENIR. By Mrs. A. E. Buchanan. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THIS pretty booklet, by the author of *The Higher Life: A Pocket Book for School Girls, &c.*, comprises maxims for every day of the year. These form a very good collection, and contain a great deal of wisdom and piety, as many of the greatest and



wisest saints and doctors have been laid under contribution. The little volume ought to prove an acceptable gift to any Catholic, and is very appropriate as a birthday present.

W. F. B.

TABULÆ SYSTEMATICÆ ET SYNOPTICÆ TOTIUS SUMMÆ THEOLOGICÆ S. THOMÆ AQUINATIS. Friburgi Helvetiorum, 1893.

THIS is not a commentary on St. Thomas. The author merely gives us, in a series of tabulated forms, a conspectus of the different questions treated in the *Summa Theologica*. We will give one short example, which, however, will adequately represent the general character of the work.

TAB. VII.

De fine ultimo (1, 2 <sup>æ</sup> qq. 1-5).	1. In communi (q. 1). 2. In particulari, seu de beatitudine	1. In quibus sit (q. 2).	{ 1. In quo consistat (q. 3). 2. Qua requirantur ad ipsam (q. 4). 3. Qualiter eam consequi possimus (q. 5).
		2. Quid sit	
		3. Qualiter eam consequi possimus	

Now, we fail to see what useful purpose all this artificiality can serve. Order is, of course, indispensable to a writer or student. But a student of the *Summa* can easily tabulate the matter mentally for himself; or, if he cannot, he has very little chance of guiding himself profitably through the labyrinth of brackets which cover the pages of Father Berthier's book.

D. C.

CONSTITUTIONES DOGMATICÆ SACROSANCTI ŒCUMENICI CONCILII VATICANI EX IPSIS EIUS ACTIS EXPLICATÆ ATQUE ILLUSTRATÆ A THEODORO GRANDERATH, SOCIETATIS JESU PRESBYTERO. Friburgi Brisgovie.

THIS is a very interesting and important book. Father Granderath divides his work into two parts. In the first he treats of the dogmatic Constitution *de fide*; and, in the second, of the first dogmatic Constitution *de Ecclesia Christi*. In each case he deals with the history of the Constitution, and gives very valuable explanations, taken from the Acts of the Council, of the doctrine which the Fathers wished to have defined. Should any doubt arise as to what the Council meant to define on any particular subject, a reference to Father Granderath's book will speedily remove the difficulty.

D. C.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

## JUBILEE YEAR IN MASONIC ROME.

THE greater part of the festivities, which have once again aroused Rome from that lethargy which has since 1870 deprived her of some of her greatest attractions, is now over. Many thousands of pilgrims have returned from the shrine of St. Peter to their distant homes in perfect happiness; and, what is more wonderful, in perfect peace. No "Pantheon incident" this time disturbed their devotions; no infuriated rabble compelled them to beat a hasty retreat. The fact is, indeed, notorious; but the reason of the fact may not be so well known to all who live at a distance from the blue skies of Italy. The reason has, however, been arrived at by one of those commonplace little journals which in free Italy endeavour to raise their voice amid the din of unceasing orders for their sequestration. If we believe the *Spalla*, the peace which the pilgrims this time enjoyed was the result of the far-seeing policy of the Government. Conscious of the loss of dignity which it underwent in its wanton outburst of rage at the time of the French pilgrimage, the Government of Rome this time resolved upon a different course of action. By the memorable incident of the 2nd of October suspicion had been roused throughout Europe that the famous law of guarantees, professing to allow the Holy Father full liberty in the government of his subjects, is but a veil to blind the eyes of the uninitiated. In a word, therefore, these suspicious, ill-noddy children, had to be hushed to sleep; and hence the peace enjoyed by

all those who, as pilgrims, visited this year the city of Peter.

Such a course of action on the part of the Government would certainly not be a new one. In 1871, nine months after the breach of the Porta Pia, Pius IX. was celebrating the silver jubilee of his coronation. King Victor Emmanuel wrote to Lanza, then president, and expressed a desire that everything possible should be done fittingly to celebrate the festivities to be made in honour of a man so truly great. Cannons were to be fired, troops to be under arms, the words "*Viva il Papa*" were to be placarded around the city. "For," said that astute monarch, "*such a course of action would be a thing highly useful in forwarding the ends of the Government.*" As such a course of action proved useful in the past, so it is not unlikely that it was deemed useful in the present; indeed, to anyone who is not a prejudiced stranger in Rome, little doubt can exist that the Masonic Government of Italy, at present but little respected by many of the nations of Europe, burdened with paper money, and sinking steadily beneath the waves of a mercilessly increasing deficit, deemed that to leave the pilgrims in peace this year would again be of advantage to their plans.

The lower members of the Masonic lodges do not, however, seem to have been well-instructed in the part they were to play. In fact, they all but defeated the secret policy of their more deeply initiated leaders. They went so far as to convoke a large meeting; and, over their glasses, poured forth a torrent of abuse against a venerable old sovereign whom all the princes of Europe have learned to love. The result, however, was anything but flattering to these ardent votaries of the world's architect. Abroad they met with derision, at home with contempt. Suffice it here to quote the *Venezia*. This paper has the reputation of being subsidized by the lodges of Italy. Of the Masonic banquet it says:—"Whenever there is any putrefaction in Italian political life—and, alas! there is too much of it to-day—the Masons are sure to appear upon the scene, even as crows discover carcasses that lie abandoned in the open country." Truly when certain men fall out, certain other men get a

chance of coming at the truth. Had these inferior Masons been better schooled in the plans of their superiors, they too would surely have withdrawn from the public gaze, and given the pilgrims the fullest freedom. Without, however, trying to hide their hatred of the Catholic religion, these men proclaimed their banquet, and invited to it over three hundred declared enemies not only of the Catholic Church but of Christ and God. In their impotency they blasphemed when the canticle of joy and thanksgiving, breaking from the lips of an enthusiastic people, rang through the arches of the world's largest temple : and their blasphemies are the best proof of the splendid success of those festivities which provoked them.

If such was the conduct of the representatives of the Masonic Government, both high and low, the conduct of the people whom they pretend to govern and represent, was of a character entirely different. The feasts of the jubilee have caused a strong revulsion of feeling throughout the land. The business classes, tired of the unrealized promises of their Piedmontese masters, have, by the sudden influx of tangible gold and silver, received an impulse to which they had long been strangers. Hence the various abortive attempts at meetings to protest against the admittance of what the *Tribuna*, the official organ of the Government, calls "*political pilgrims*," appearing to these indigent sons of toil as fruitless attempts to prevent their pockets from being filled, have only succeeded in increasing the anger of all who are not mere pensioners of the Government. The old Roman press, too, encouraged by the presence of so many thousand allies, has definitely raised its head, while even many an Italian radical journal has outstripped it in invective against the present order of things in Rome. A few journals, it is true, in the pay of the Government, have endeavoured to withstand the tide of public opinion : but the jubilee of Leo XIII. has revealed to all in Rome a glimpse of the old days. The Romans have winced with anger at the thought of what they have unwillingly been deprived of, and the indignation, ever increasing, has spread far and wide, even among those who were at first blinded and coaxed by the glittering promises of the present tyrants.



The celebration of the jubilee has been, as it were, a halting-place in the march of Italian affairs, a standpoint from which the curious have been able to view the events of the past few years. And, alas! what a spectacle was presented to the eyes of those who dared to look back! What has been done for Rome since the Piedmontese set foot within her walls, filling the air with promises of freedom and prosperity? Of course the realization of these promises could not be expected to show themselves immediately the disregarded flag of truce was struck from the summit of the Porta Pia. The old Rome of Romulus was not built in a day; Piedmontese Masonic Rome could not be built in so short a time. Days, however, have become years, years lustres, and we flatter ourselves the advantages of Masonic rule have begun to show themselves. What advantages, therefore, has Rome derived from her new rulers?

Pass through the streets of Rome to-day, and look around you. From gutter and protecting doorway a hundred arms will be stretched out towards you. "No bread! no work!" will be the cries you hear on all sides. Rome was, indeed, ever a city full of mendicants, and many a superficial mind has used the fact as argument against the government of the Popes. But it was undeniable that the vast majority of beggars in Rome in the old days were not Romans, but strangers from the adjoining States. Not so to-day! The present Government keeps a strict eye upon the influx of beggars into Rome. Last year, within the space of a few months, no fewer than twenty-six thousand beggars were by the Government expelled from Rome. The beggars to-day in Rome are Romans, and, considering the size and population of Rome, far exceed the number of beggars anywhere else existing. It may have been noticed by some of our readers that a philanthropist had recently proposed that if a banquet were given to the poor of Rome it would be a gracious act, and one worthy of the celebration of the silver wedding of the sovereigns of Sardinia. The idea was a good one, and evoked public applause; but when it was found out that even according to minimized statistics the number of beggars in Rome fully qualified to sit down to the regal

banquet would amount to from twenty-five to thirty thousand, the Masonic Government, ashamed to meet its own offspring, living and unmistakable proofs of the falsehood of its promises, quietly let the matter drop into oblivion. Nay, as these poor might prove a nuisance during the *Nozze* of the *Nozze d'Argento*, and as their numbers might suggest to the visitors that Italy is to-day plunged by its rulers into the most profound misery, orders were given that poor mothers were to keep their poor children indoors upon certain days unless they wished the city warders to keep them in prison instead.<sup>1</sup> Many of these poor are men and women who have been out of work for two, three, or even more years. Many others are people of families, which a few years ago enjoyed a sufficient competency, but whose money has been swallowed up either in exorbitant taxes or lost in shameful and unpunished robberies in the public administration.<sup>2</sup>

\* Amongst the festivities of the *Nozze d'Argento*, the following letter, written by the pupils of an elementary school, and forwarded to King Humbert, may be of interest to our readers. Its existence was unknown till it found its way into the *Osservatore Cattolico* of Milan:—

"To-morrow (22nd April) we shall have a holiday, for it is the day of the silver wedding of the Savoy consorts, Humbert and Margaret. We know that since the 18th of this month the King has received five thousand recommendations and seventeen thousand petitions of poor families who want bread and aid. We know that through the heavy imposts and taxes, many have been reduced to bankruptcy and to extreme misery, and are obliged to emigrate so as to avoid dying of hunger. The ministers and deputies who enjoy the millions order us to exult, but we cannot, since we see around us so much misery. We beseech the king and queen to remedy the numerous evils inflicted upon our Italy." Letters to the same effect have reached King Humbert from all parts of Italy, especially from the Socialists of the North. At Rome during the feasts of the silver wedding some poor women were seen endeavouring to throw supplications into the carriage of the German Emperor. They were protests against the municipality of Rome, which, to place a few more hundred francs at the disposal of the feast-makers, had ordered that the money spent every year in giving boots to the ragged children at Government schools should this year be devoted to decorating intangible Rome the more fittingly to receive its guests.

\* The deposits in the banks in 1887 were £44,000,000; in 1889, £66,000,000; decrease in two years, £8,000,000. Mortgage on real property in 1888 was £200,000,000; in 1890, £320,000,000; increase in two years, £60,000,000. At the present rate of retrogression in a few years the ownership of real property in Italy will have passed to the hands of money-lenders, home or foreign; and private deposits in the banks, *viz.*, the savings of the people, will have ceased to exist.

There is yet another work of the Masons that renders the sufferings of the poor far harder to bear. Even men who have no sympathy with religious orders and convents cannot deny that in such institutions the poor have found protectors and benefactors. The Masons have done their worst to deprive the poor of this last consolation. Friar and nun have long since gone, and the houses where they once received the poor are now converted into Government offices. The few religious that still live in the country have not enough to keep themselves in the scanty fare their rule prescribes. The beggars in their hundreds flock to-day as of old to the convent gates; for when confidence is lost in the philanthropical declarations of the Masons, the poor still know that if friar or nun still have any alms to bestow, they will receive it. But too often the good religious are no longer able to help them. Indeed we know an instance in which the superioress of a convent, a cultivated and refined lady, begged, with tears<sup>r</sup> in her eyes, a batch of beggars to leave her doorway, declaring at the same time that there was not a morsel of bread in the house, every *solido* having been paid away the day before to the inexorable tax-collector.

This, then, is one of the first results of twenty years of Masonic government, one which reveals itself not only to the eye of the stranger in Rome, but to the eyes of the whole world! Italy, a nation capable of supporting millions upon her luxurious soil, is to-day sending so many of her sons to other lands that she seriously threatens the primacy of our own country on this head. Only the other day it was announced that as many as three thousand four hundred Italians had landed in America in the hope of there finding an employment and a livelihood which Masonic Italy had denied them. With reason, therefore, did the reigning Pontiff in his letter to the people of that country, whose interests he has so much at heart, appeal to the unmistakable evidence of facts, and brand the patriotism proclaimed by the Masons to be merely "*a sectarian egotism*, desirous of having all things beneath its control."

The cessation of all work goes hand in hand with an almost incredible increase in the price of comestibles. The

lower classes in Italy have ever been noted for the frugal meals which they make; a little bread, a plate of macaroni with a little sauce, and a little wine, is for them a handsome meal. Indeed such a dish for the vast numbers who live from Sunday to Saturday upon *polenta* (the Indian meal, so common a dish among the poor of Ireland), would be a luxury. Small, indeed, would have been the favour if the present all-absorbing Government had left these necessary articles of food at an obtainable price, yet such has not been the case. Food of every kind has become dearer, while the wages of those who are fortunate enough to get work have not increased in proportion. Wine, for instance, is sold to-day in Rome for six, seven, eight *soldi* the half litre; formerly, we are told by those that remember those brighter days, the same amount was sold for two *soldi*. "It were not so bad," add these same men, "were it wine they gave us to-day. Formerly they gave us wine cheap and good, to-day we get rubbish, and pay highly for it in the bargain." It is a poor consolation for a Roman in such circumstances to know that he is sacrificing himself and his comfort to a cause which he cordially hates, one which has been forced upon him against his will. No one who knows Rome—not from the interior of a first-class hotel in whose easy arm-chairs and comfortable smoking-rooms the majority of articles on the state of Rome are written for our English reviews, but from visiting the haunts of the humble, from conversations with the poor—will question the truth of the lamentations poured forth by the intelligent representatives of the working classes. Even such men as do know Rome from the interior of a modern hotel, cannot have failed to notice the warder-like severity to which every vehicle, carriage, or wagon is subjected upon entering a gate of modern Rome. All must have noticed the *dogana* officials standing by their ever-vibrating scales, armed with skewer-shaped instruments of different lengths, destined to be inserted into every packet, sack, or cart-load of goods that approaches the gates. These indefatigable officials mount every vehicle, pierce its contents in every direction, applying the withdrawn skewer to their nose in the hope of



being thereby able to cast a few more *soldi* into the greedy vortex of the Government funds. No packet is too small to be taxable. It is true that vegetables are not subjected to a special impost; but follow them to the public market, and, amid the heaps of vegetables there piled up, you will find the Government functionary busy distributing permissions to the unfortunate vendors to occupy a few square feet of the market-place; for which, of course, more *soldi* have to be paid. The poor old women who possess not enough in this world to buy a ticket are driven about hither and thither in quite a piteous way, until, perhaps, they are fortunate enough to find some philanthropical shopkeeper who allows them to deposit their baskets under the protecting wing of his doorway.

Neither do the shopkeepers, in their turn, fare better. Even the unobserving visitor must have noticed the absence of windows in the shops of Rome. The truth is, that the taxes upon windows are so exorbitant that if the shopkeeper wishes to live, he must perforce cut down his windows as much as possible. Goods are, therefore, hung outside, or displayed within the badly-lighted shops; but shop windows are few. An instance of exorbitant taxation recently fell under our notice. It was that of a man who, a few years ago paid some five francs for his windows, whereas to-day, for the same windows, he pays some twenty francs. Besides this, every ticket that the salesman wishes to expose in those heavily-taxed windows, has to bear a postage or inland revenue stamp, otherwise its owner runs counter to the law. The owners of houses are in the same sorry plight. Not to speak of the succession tax, which is so great, that to pay it four times would be to destroy the original capital, the ordinary taxes are so high that the governors of United Italy have themselves confessed that they are at their highest possible figure, and cannot be further augmented.<sup>1</sup> It is quite

<sup>1</sup> An artisan's family comprising four persons, and earning, when fully employed, £95 a-year, will be taxed as follows: Direct taxes, £8 7s. 6d.; indirect, £13 4s. 6d.; total, £22 12s.; *i.e.*, one-fourth of the income of the working classes. It has long been discovered that increase in the items of taxation brings no increase in the ultimate amount received from such taxation, showing that every increase only creates a greater number of people who are unable to pay the tax at all.

a loss to a proprietor to let the first floor of his house alone. Unless, therefore, he can succeed in letting two floors, he is bound to shut his house and report it as unoccupied. At the end of the season the proprietors of the hotels, when their occupants, though many, fail to fill them, have to rid themselves of their visitors by sending them to a common rendezvous, where, it is hoped, all will make a full hotel, and cease to be a loss to its proprietor. Nay, to such extremes have the taxes been pushed in Italy, that the most sacred rights of man, the family tie, has been degraded into being the foundation of a tyrannical family tax. And the result of all this taxation? An ever-increasing deficit! Statistics just published show that the debts of the treasury, which were at the end of June, 1892, some five hundred and twenty-nine millions of francs, had, by the end of March of this year, amounted to five hundred and ninety-seven millions, making the increase in nine months sixty-eight million francs.

In the city the greatest depression prevails. Often has it been said that the abundance or scarcity of music and singing in the streets of Rome, is a clear indication of the content or discontent of its population. To-day its music is rare. The old rambling happy-go-lucky stamp of minstrel is extinct. The few specimens that survive bear no resemblance, not even such a resemblance as evolutionists would call "mimicry" to the exotic well-fed specimens of the same tribe that grace our English public thoroughfares. In the various quarters of the city, where the sound of music and the gay laugh chased the weary hours in days gone by, the most sullen and gloomy silence to-day prevails. The very carnival is a failure, and this year's attempt to provoke mirth was met on the part of the populace by a sarcastic proposal to parade through the city a skit upon the bank scandals. The inhabitants are unstrung, demoralized; the public taste is vitiated and lowered. The literature of the day is full of mawkish sentimentality; the bills that advertise it are full of the most gross blood-curdling scenes of assassinations, streams of highly-coloured scarlet blood being considered the best means of attracting public attention. Moral degradation

prevails in the theatres and in the anti-clerical papers; it is introduced into the bosom of families by infamous pictures and *double entendres*, printed in attractive form upon the sides of match-boxes. Surprising as it may seem to say it, the very fundamental distinction between right and wrong is growing, nay, perhaps more truly has grown, weak and indistinct in the minds of many. It was but recently that the *Messaggero*, a widely-read journal, asked and provoked correspondence on this point:—"If a man kills his wife, is he committing an act of violence, or is he exercising a right?"

What has been said of the literature of Piedmontese Rome may be said of the system of education in vogue at the universities. The very liberal papers themselves have cried out against it. "Fathers of families, send not your daughters to the universities," has been their cry. And the irresponsible Government looks on with complacency. Indeed, how could it be otherwise. "*Libera chiesa in stato libero*"—"Free church in free state," was formerly their cry; "*Libero amore in libero paese*"—"Free love in a free country," has recently been the cry of some of their organs. And at this very moment there is before the Italian Parliament a law ordering that civil marriage should precede the religious ceremony, under the most severe pains, *e.g.*, the illegitimacy of the offspring of such as do not violate their conscience and obey such a law, and the imprisonment of the priest that dares to perform the religious ceremony before the civil function has been completed. And this, in a country whose rulers pretend to advocate freedom of conscience; in a country whose Government assumes, as a first principle of its ecclesiastical legislation, the separation of Church and State. "By the law of Italy at present, open concubinage is unpunishable; but if a man, in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, wishes to consecrate his marriage in the sight of God, he must be punished: the Sacrament of Matrimony must be treated worse than concubinage; for while the latter is recognised by the law, for the former alone are reserved the rigours of the penal code."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Protest of the bishops of Venice.

Not less to say, the social condition of the people has suffered immensely by such surroundings. The men have become cowardly and timorously ; the use of that most dastardly weapon, the knife, is more frequent than in the old days. The number of deeds of violence committed every year is steadily and enormously on the increase. Take up one of the journals of modern Rome, and your moral perceptions will be shocked by the unprecedented number of recorded murders, suicides, stabblings, and treacheries. Crime steadily increases, despite the countless numbers of soldiers and police-agents that are everywhere to be seen. Brigandage flourishes as much to-day as ever. It was not long ago that a party of tourists were surprised and robbed on the Via Appia, not very far from the gates of Rome, and close to one of the forts that have earned for the Rome of to-day the epithet of *intangible*. In a word, an intense feeling of insecurity has seized upon the hearts of all. Witness the fear and trepidation with which shopkeepers close their shops on an occasion of every trifling demonstration. "You cannot in these days," we have heard an Italian say, "trust your own brother." We have also met other men who were afraid to speak aloud of the state of things in Rome. "Hush !" said one, "the very walls have ears in these days." We do not deny that these men were of a timorous disposition, but it cannot be denied that their fear gives an insight into the terror in which all continually live. It is undeniable also that the Government is far from freeing the refractory from such a state of fear. It is a fact well known in Rome, that during the last few weeks a member of parliament went around to the various houses and shops of a part of the city to collect contributions for the festivities of the "Nozze d'Argento." If any man refused to contribute, his name was at once asked, and inscribed upon a register entitled, S.P.Q.R.

The army, too, is in a sorry condition, composed as it is, for the greater part, of dwarf infantry. These generally ill-developed boys are torn from their homes by the universal conscription, and dressed against their wills in the uniform of United Italy. They are at once sent off from their friends



to various parts of the kingdom, thereby the better to choke their dissatisfaction. Neapolitan young men are judiciously scattered here and there throughout the country, for their apathy to the idea of United Italy is well known. The Neapolitan territory is in its turn occupied by strangers, who exchange with the Neapolitans a mutual and undying hatred. To such a pitch, however, has discontentment spread through the ranks, that we have recently heard from the Italian Press that the officers are afraid to punish the men. The soldiers, moreover, do not hide their discontentment; they will talk to you openly about it; and this not in private, but in public. They are all ill-fed and ill-paid. Out of the generous sum of one penny a-day which they receive, they have to find needles and cotton, wash their collars, buy blacking, pipe-clay, and other trifles.

These are some of the results of twenty years of Piedmontese rule in Rome. If we have not mentioned the advantages which Rome has derived from the new Government, it is because we have found none to mention. Rome has, indeed, been enlarged; a new quarter has been added to it; but of this we must not speak, unless we wish to place it among the disadvantages. Rows of houses, built in the worst possible fashion and of the poorest materials, cracking and splitting even before the scaffolding is taken down, propped up with beams and timber—these, we submit, are things which it would be difficult to call advantages. The interior of these houses is in keeping with the exterior; some are full of families promiscuously huddled together in one room in the greatest misery, others are quite empty. Statistics recently published show that in Rome there are at least ninety thousand rooms unoccupied. Several public works were, indeed, undertaken: few have been accomplished. It must, moreover, be remembered that to institute a comparison on this head between the Rome of to-day and the Rome of 1870, is not to institute a fair comparison. Allowances must, in justice, be made for what the Popes, with more money at their disposal than the exorbitant taxes of to-day place in the hands of the new Government, would in the same time have done for Rome. If this be kept in

mind, the improvements, if any, effected by the present Government will surely fall into insignificance.

That what we have so far said is not the ravings of a bigot, may well be seen from the following extract from the *Voce della Verità*, a "clerical" journal, it is true, but which in the following lines merely epitomizes the complaints uttered at various times by journals of all classes. The Minister, Giolitti, had said that pilgrims come to Rome, not so much to see the Pope as for other purposes. The *Voce della Verità* proceeds to draw up a list of other attractions which they might have come to see. Let the following suffice:—

"They came [says that journal] to see the ruins of the third Rome, its falling houses, with their arches walled up; the number of business failures,<sup>1</sup> the number of those who have already failed, the number of liquidations, voluntary and juridical. They came to see the crowds of famished wretches that with petulancy stretch out their hands to you at every step. They came to witness the cry of indignation uttered by the masses against a system of government that cannot legislate—that is powerless to prevent scandals in public administrations, which at most can make a few arrests when all the evil is done, and many are ruined. They came to see a juggler who, at the moment when light and revelation were breaking in upon the dark abyss [the bank scandals], declared himself unable to proceed in the investigation. They came to get an idea of the desolation and abjection of Rome, of the slime, political and administrative, that adheres to its ruins, witness alike of the vain boasting, of the inadequacy, of the imbecility of the means to-day in vogue. They came to see the immorality of its literature, its playhouses, its Press, its houses, where honour and peace of soul and body are lost."

There is, however, one special point to which it would be well to call attention before we end, and it is this: If there were any one thing which was promised by the Piedmontese to the Romans, it was liberty.

"In Italy the people have yet to be made; they are, however, ready to break the bonds that restrain them. Speak to them often and much; above all, tell them about their miseries and their wants. The people are slow of understanding; but let the

<sup>1</sup> The number of bankruptcies in 1879 was 700; in 1880, 1,200; in 1887, 1,600; in 1888, 2,000; in 1889, 2,400.

active part of the society be penetrated with these sentiments of compassion for the people, and then, sooner or later, the people will act. Learned discussions are neither necessary nor opportune. There are regenerating words which contain all that it is necessary often to repeat to the people—*Liberty, the Rights of Man, Progress, Equality, Fraternity!* These are what the people will understand, especially when you set them off by such opposite words as *Despotism, Privileges, Tyranny, Slavery,* &c.

Such, in 1846, was the language of Mazzini, the forerunner of Italian revolution. This, his advice, has since that day been scrupulously observed by the Government; *Liberty, Equality, Rights of Man*, have ever been their watch-words; and by these, their cries, they have succeeded in gaining the moral support of many a philanthropist, who, deafened by their vociferations, recognised in them the vindicators and liberators of what he had learned to look upon as a downtrodden and tyrannized population. It is, however, undeniable that liberty is a stranger in Italy. Every week some new fact happens that belies the promises of the new Government, putting its representatives in the position of men who have got into power by false pretences. Of course, these facts are hushed up, and do not reach cities as far distant as London and New York. It was but the other day that it came to light that a man who was an Italian and a patriot, a comrade of Garibaldi in 1867, and is now a correspondent to various journals, had recently as many as seventeen telegrams intercepted by the Government during the short space of two months. The news contained in the despatches was, of course, of a character likely to raise suspicions hostile to the present masters of Rome. Here, then, is liberty! What does such a course of action show? Does it not clearly reveal the state of fear in which the Government lives? Is it not like avoiding the light, and loving to walk in the darkness? By such means does United Italy succeed in hiding her internal deformities from the eyes of Europe. Nevertheless, despite the care that is taken lest these scandals should be bruited abroad, despite the diligence that is exercised lest such news should be transmitted even from one part of the peninsula to another, the Italian people are from time to time startled by glaring

examples of their much-lauded liberty. The following may serve as a specimen:—A few weeks ago the elections were on the point of taking place at Serra-di-falco, in Sicily. Two candidates—Signor Riolo and Signor Baglio—were competing for the constituency. There was this difference between them—that Signor Riolo was a man after the Government's own heart, while Signor Baglio was not. The Prefect of Caltanissetta, in accordance with orders received from superior quarters, called together all the syndics and principal men of the neighbourhood, and inculcated upon them the necessity of turning every stone to secure the election of Signor Riolo. The Syndic of Marianopoli alone refused to co-operate in such a scheme.

The day for the election at last came. At Mussomeli, the Syndic, a warm supporter of Signor Riolo, and master of the police, placed troops around the houses of the most respectable citizens, and around the palace of the Prince of Tralin, who favoured the cause of Baglio. He likewise subjected to examination all those who visited the palace, placing under arrest the workmen of the prince. At Montedoro the Government representative called into his presence a certain Signor Trigona, a known friend of Baglio, who had just arrived in that place. Signor Trigona appeared in due time, and was introduced, according to usage, doffing his hat and bowing. The Government representative was most affable; he prayed his visitor not to incommode himself in the least, bidding him to be seated and put on his hat. He then entered upon a brief conversation on trivialities and after a few minutes arose, exclaiming:—"Badly educated fellow that you are, do you sit down and wear your hat in my presence?" He then touched the button of the electric bell, attendants soon appeared, and, despite the remonstrances and explanations of the unwary Trigona, the Government representative declared him arrested, and kept him in confinement for fifteen days, thus effectually placing him *hors-de-combat* as far as the election was concerned. All this sounds like romance, but not one word of it can be denied. The worst is, however, not yet told. Signor Baglio had succeeded in gaining a great majority in his own native town,



San Cataldo. The prefect, therefore, sent orders to the other communes to object in mass to the votes in favour of Signor Baglio. In some places every single ballot was blackballed. Nay, at Valle-lunga, Aqua-viva and Campo-franco, those who protested against this confiscation of legal votes were arrested, and the adherents of Baglio were driven away at the point of the bayonet. The same was done at Serra-di-falco, and when the population protested against the unjust confiscation of ninety-two votes in favour of Baglio, the 58th Infantry, under one Captain Setta, opened fire upon them, killing two and wounding many.<sup>1</sup> Such then is Italian Liberty, Equality, and the Rights of Man. One more example of it, and we have done.

A few weeks ago a poor innkeeper, who had been stabbed by some scoundrels educated in Masonic principles, breathed his last in the Government hospital of Santo Spirito. Before dying the poor man asked for and saw a minister of the religion which best commended itself to him at that solemn moment. It was accordingly announced that the funeral was to be of a Christian character; the authorities of the hospital, however, intervened, and would not allow the corpse to be carried over-night into a Christian church. Nor was that all. These representatives of the Rights of Man carried their tyranny so far that they tore down from the summit of the hearse the plain black cross of wood (the distinguishing mark of a Christian funeral in Italy), and, despite the remonstrances of the friends of the dead man, mounted in its place a bunch of cheap, perishable flowers.

<sup>1</sup> As an example of how these episodes of scandalous tyranny can in Italy be hushed up, it may be interesting to give the account of these disturbances at Serra-di-falco, as it appeared in the *Messaggero*. The account given in our text is that of a conscientious eye-witness. It will be seen how differently was it reported in the Masonic paper:—

“SERIOUS DISORDERS IN SICILY.”

“Serra-di-falco, 6. On occasion of the elections there was a demonstration in favour of Signor Baglio, which promoted disorders. The Marshal of the Carbiniers was struck on the head with a stone. The agitators made use of guns and revolvers, wounding a guard in the hand. Then the commander of the troops, seeing a soldier fall, and believing him wounded, and hearing the bullets whistling around him, ordered some soldiers to fire. Two were killed and two wounded. Twenty men were arrested, some armed with long knives, who were tried to wound the Police.”

Such again is Italian Liberty and Freedom. Scarcely was the tongue of the muckraker locked in death, when his last wish, a thing to all people except Masons most sacred, was disregarded, trampled under foot and violated.

We may now see with what precision the present Pontiff has described the ruin that the Masons have brought upon Rome—a ruin which involves not only the material interests of the State, but also the morality of the people.

“Most short [said he in his letter to the Italian people] is the road from religious to social ruin. No longer raised up to heavenly hope and love, the heart of man, capable of and ever seeking after the infinite, turns us off with unsatiable ardour upon the things of the earth: hence necessarily and unavoidably a continual war of passions greedy of enjoyments, riches, high stations; hence an inexhaustible fount of rancours, differences, corruptions and crimes. In our Italy before the present state of things there was not wanting disorders moral and social, but what a sad sight does she not to-day place before our eyes! In the family there is a considerable diminution of that loving respect which is the soul of domestic harmony, the authority of parents is often disregarded both by children and by persons, quarrels are frequent, divorce not rare. In the city, every day sees an increase of civil discord, of bitter hatred between the various orders of the citizens, of the unbridled liberty of the rising generations educated in the atmosphere of a misconceived freedom and no longer respecting anything above or below them, of the enticements to vice, of precocious crimes and public scandals. The State, instead of being content with its high and most noble duty of recognising, guarding and strengthening in their harmonious whole all rights both human and divine, believes itself supreme master of them, refuses to recognise them or restricts them according to its own pleasure. The social order is, in general, uprooted from the very foundations. Books and journals, schools and professional chairs, unions and theatres, monuments and political speeches, placards, and the fine arts, all combine to pervert the mind and corrupt the heart. In the meantime, the people groan under oppression and misery, anarchical sects are busy, the working classes labour under loads, and ruin and well-to-do ranks of Socialists, Communists, and Anarchists, lives of pleasure is weakened, and many minds, long unable long to come with dignity to face the social possibility, in a cowardly manner and by suicide abandon their lives.”

We have cast a glance at the Rome of the Masons. How different, alas! from the Rome of a few years ago, when

the nation's content found expression in the unending processions and *fêtes* which a grateful people celebrated to honour the wise government of the liberal-minded and generous-hearted Pius IX., realizing, as he himself used to say, nothing else but the desires and hopes of Gregory XVI. Then indeed was the Italian capital a scene of mirth, one festivity following another through the livelong year. That great Pontiff, obedient to the wishes of his people, of free access to all, dedicated an entire day out of each week to the hearing of the complaints of his subjects. The taxes were few and trifling: even those that existed were by him either reduced (as was that upon salt) or entirely abolished (as was that upon patents).

"It is with a view to the public good [said Pius IX., on a memorable occasion] that since the first moment of my elevation to the pontifical throne, I have, in obedience to the counsels with which I have felt inspired from on high, done all that I have thus far been able to do. I am still ready, with the aid of God and without trespassing upon the sovereignty of the Pontificate, to do still more in the future. I have the testimony of three millions of my subjects; I have the testimony of the whole of Europe, as to what I have done so as to bring myself into close sympathy with my people, to unite them to me, to attain a more intimate knowledge of their wants, and to provide for them."<sup>1</sup>

Neither indeed has the memory of those old days yet perished. Eyes have been wistfully turning back to them during the recent festivities; and from the recollection of them many minds have been drawing brilliant pictures of what Rome would again be, were a reconciliation between the conflicting parties to pave the way for their return.

"Every time [says the *Vera Roma*] that a Papal festivity lends a new impulse to the life of Rome, by means of the strangers it attracts from all parts of the globe, and especially from the various provinces of Italy, we are besieged with invitations to tell the Romans and the Italians in general of the numerous advantages that would accrue to Rome and to the whole of Italy, were the fatal dissension ended . . . It is joy to see the raptures to which the writers of such letters abandon themselves. Many point out how Rome would at once pass from the depths of so

<sup>1</sup> Reply of Pius IX. to Cardinal Antonelli on the opening of the Council of State—Balleydier—*Révolution de Rome*, tom. i., page 51.

many misfortunes to the summit of unalloyed felicity, confidence, and union; the sources of strength and riches would again appear and flourish among us. Others call attention to the fact that this good fortune of Rome would be but the forerunner of that of the rest of Italy, for it would bring with it the blending together of all the conservative forces of the country into an immense national body before which the Radical body would sink into insignificance. Others point to the natural, absolute, and conditional *regeneration* of the common netherland that would spring up in the various States were they duly recognised; they point to the increased zeal that would animate the soldier to defend the common country without doing violence to personal feelings or religious opinions. Who, ask others, could then despise our country as weak on account of the variety of opinions and party spirit that pervades all classes, penetrating even into the army? How profound a peace would not ensue, what security for the development of industry and commerce, for the restoration of science and the arts, at present so much sacrificed to anarchy and passion. The ages of glory, of riches, of the power of Rome and Italy would no longer be a myth of haphazard return, as it has so far been, but a foundation would exist for the legitimate aspirations of our nation to resume her old place among the nations of the world."

"But," adds the same journal, "there is an unavoidable *but* which makes all such thoughts mere day-dreams and poetry in presence of the unsympathetic evidence of facts." And so indeed it is. He would be a bold man who would endeavour to lift the veil that covers the future, to predict a reconciliation or the imminent defeat of one or other of the contending parties. One thing alone is certain, and it is this: that when Leo XIII. is laid at rest in the Basilica of St. John's, future pontiffs will scrupulously carry out the same policy that he has ever followed. The Church of Rome, taught by the vicissitudes of eighteen hundred years, can afford to wait her time; she that passed through the invasions of Barbarossa, survived the captivity of Avignon, and fell not before the terrors of a Western schism, has no cause to fear the enemies that to-day attack her. For the present her ruler is persecuted, vilified, insulted, and branded with the name of enemy of that country which gave him birth, while the real enemies of that country, arrogating to themselves the name of patriots, are draining her very last resources, and sending her children into exile. Such, by an uncrushing



disposition of Providence, is the aspect of Rome to-day ; but we look forward to the day when a future generation, looking back upon the deeds of 1870 onwards, just as we to-day look back to the deeds of 1846, will assert upon the incontrovertible evidence of facts, that Leo XIII. was the sole friend of his country, and that Masonic patriotism was, indeed, nothing short of the sectarian egotism that Leo has proclaimed it.

A. O'LOUGHLIN.

### THE TREATMENT OF INEBRIATES.<sup>1</sup>

IN a former number of the I. E. RECORD attention was drawn to the subject of the treatment of habitual drunkards.<sup>2</sup> Since then the matter has seemed of sufficient importance to demand the appointment of a committee to collect and examine evidence, and to report to Parliament. In 1891 and 1892 Lord Herschell moved, in the House of Lords, for an inquiry into the best manner of dealing with them ; and on the latter occasion it was promised, on behalf of the Government, that a committee would be appointed to make inquiry on the subject. In due time the promise was fulfilled ; and the Home Secretary, writing to his committee, thus indicated the object of their inquiry :—

“Great difference of opinion having arisen as to what kind and degree of punishment for offences committed by habitual drunkards would be most effectual, both as a deterrent and with a view to the reformation of such offenders, it appears to me that advantage would result from an inquiry being made into the subject. I accordingly hereby appoint you to be a committee to inquire into the best means of dealing with habitual drunkards.”

It may serve some good purpose, if I endeavour to draw

<sup>1</sup>Report of the Departmental Committee on the Treatment of Inebriates, presented to both Houses of Parliament, 1893. Inebriates' Committee: Notes of Evidence taken by the Committee on the Treatment of Inebriates, 1893.

<sup>2</sup>*Homes for Inebriates*, September, 1890.

attention to some salient points of the recommendations of the committee so appointed, and of the evidence submitted to it: the more so as, among the causes of the comparative failure of existing Acts, the report sets forth as the very first:—“(1) The want of sufficient notoriety of their existence, even among magistrates themselves.”

In our former paper on this subject we meant to plead that something should be done to save our inebriates. For that purpose it was stated that in these countries sixty thousand valuable lives—often very valuable lives—are lost, year after year, by the excessive use of alcoholic drink; that in the case of the unhappy victims there was question, as the highest authorities assured us, of a physical as well as of a moral disease, for the permanent cure of which physical restraint was, humanly speaking, an absolute necessity; that we had done little for them thus far, though to save them from an early and dishonoured death was at once the highest charity and the plainest duty. In 1879 the Habitual Drunkards' Act passed, and in 1888 the Inebriates' Act. The *precis* of their main provisions, which I have already given, may be worth quoting here:—

“(a) The Habitual Drunkards' Act of 1879 was an ‘Act to Facilitate the Control and Cure of Habitual Drunkards.’

(b) A habitual drunkard was defined, ‘A person who, not being amenable to any jurisdiction in lunacy, is notwithstanding, by reason of his habitual intemperate drinking, at times dangerous to himself, or herself, or others, or incapable of managing himself or herself and his or her affairs.’

(c) The local authority can grant a licence to a person or persons to open a retreat. There must be a resident, who shall be responsible for its management; and a qualified medical man shall be employed as medical attendant.

(d) Any drunkard may apply for admission. He must present a declaration of two persons that he is an habitual drunkard in the meaning of the Act; and the applicant's signature must be attested by two justices, who shall explain to him the effect of the application, and who shall be satisfied that he is an habitual drunkard.

(e) The patient can then be detained for the term mentioned in the application; the term not to exceed twelve calendar months. He will not be free to leave, except in one or two special cases, before the expiration of the term.”

Like all our attempts at temperance legislation, this was certainly halting, and bound to be ineffectual. The main defects which we have already pointed out, and which indeed must seem sufficiently palpable, are that there is no provision for compulsory retirement in any case, no matter how extreme; that the time of detention is limited to twelve months, which in some cases has been found to be insufficient; and, finally, that the retreats are open only to those who may be able to support themselves, or who may be kept in them by private benevolence. It is gratifying to find that in all these respects the defects which we have ventured to notice have been remarked on by various expert witnesses before the committee, and that the committee itself has recommended, in its report, that amendments such as suggested should be embodied in future legislation. The committee found that the matter for their inquiry naturally divided itself into two branches:—(1) The question of habitual drunkards, as such, and their cure; and (2) the cases of drunkards who “came within the action of the criminal law, who found themselves before the magistrates often for violence, as well as for drunkenness.”

Under the first head we come, in the first place, to the question of

#### COMPULSION.

The success of retreats for inebriates must, I think, eventually depend, first of all, on the right, in certain well-defined cases, of compulsory confinement. Neither reason nor experience warrant us in the hope that the greater number of the slaves of the drink-craze will voluntarily walk into establishments where alcohol is never found, and out of which they may never come until they have lost all taste for it. Such a right, of course, must be, and can be, safeguarded; but it is very easy to talk foolish sentiment about a man's liberty, when in reality there is question only of saving his life. Here are the views of some of the witnesses. Sir Andrew Clark, President of the Royal College of Physicians, was asked (question 1,434):—

“Taking your opinion generally, Sir Andrew, you are

thoroughly in favour of the principle of compulsion, as distinguished from what is called the voluntary principle?—Reply. If you will permit me to put it in this way, it is not only that I am in favour of compulsion, but that I have the strongest possible conviction that nothing but compulsion will succeed.

1,445. Would you substitute it for the voluntary system, or would you keep both?—I would keep both. I would still keep some retreats for persons who voluntarily submit themselves; but I have no hope myself, from the experience which I have, and it is not inconceivable, that this will ever be a successful method."

Under another branch of the subject he replied—and I give this reply specially for the study of those who persist in talking sentiment about the liberty of men to take away their lives:—

"I would have his liberty sacrificed for the good of his family, of the state, and of the community; I would have him put into an institution, and kept there until he was cured."

Colonel McHardy, Prison Commissioner for Scotland, in reply to question 1,241:—

"You would wish, I understand, to make the detention, if his cure is not complete, compulsory?—Yes, certainly.

And probably you would also make his entrance into the retreat, in the first instance, compulsory?—I should do so, most certainly, after all necessary precautions being taken."

Evidence of a similar nature was given by medical men, magistrates, prison governors, and others; but I will add only the following. It is an extract from the interesting and valuable information given to the committee by the Superiress and Licenses of St. Veronica's Retreat at Chiswick, the only establishment of the kind, I believe, under Catholic management in these countries:—

"845. Have you, from your own knowledge, found that there is a difficulty in getting persons to sign themselves away?—Very difficult. It is astonishing the number of patients that could be got in if only there were some compulsory legislation. I receive hundreds of letters in the course of the year asking me to send for patients; and assuming that, as we are licensed, we have compulsory powers, by persons who do not know much about the law.

847. Well, I take it from that that you are in favour of there being more compulsion?—Most decidedly. We want very stringent legislation on the subject."



We cannot be surprised to find that the committee was led by such a body of strongly-expressed and unanimous opinion, on the part of expert witnesses, to recommend :—

“That power should be given for the compulsory committal to a retreat of persons coming within the definition of an habitual drunkard, as laid down in the Act of 1879, on the application of their relations or friends, or other persons interested in their welfare. Such application to be made to any judge of the High Court, county court judge, stipendiary magistrate, or justices sitting in quarter or petty sessions, who shall decide on the propriety of the application.”

And, again, in page 6 of the report :—

“As to the most difficult point in our inquiry, we found an almost, if not an entirely, unanimous agreement among the witnesses, that to render the work of the retreats generally beneficial, the system of compulsory commitment, as well as detention, should be legalized, and that those coming within the definition of habitual drunkards (as laid down in Section 3 of the Act of 1879) should, under proper safeguards, and after careful investigation held in each case, be treated in a manner somewhat similar to that now adopted with regard to lunatics, and retained in retreats or reformatory homes for a considerable period. The suggestion is to *supplement*, and not to *replace*, by compulsion, the present voluntary system.”

There are other points in this interesting report, and in the evidence of the several witnesses, that would be well worthy of notice; but for the present space will not permit. So far we have confined our remarks to one point only, but it is the one on which the success of any legislative attempt at the reformation of inebriates must most largely depend. In the legislation which is likely soon to follow the labours of the committee, it is to be hoped that its recommendation will be fully acted on. The experience of the past is not, it must be confessed, quite assuring. Twenty years ago another committee took evidence of a similar kind, and made recommendations quite as strong; and men who had taken an interest in, and made a study of the subject, proposed legislation accordingly. But the defenders of liberty took alarm, and in deference to them every useful proposal had to be whittled down, and a measure passed that, like so many others under similar circumstances, seemed cunningly

designed to effect the least possible good with the greatest possible ado. Meantime twenty years have passed, and in each of them the annual holocaust of sixty thousand lives has been permitted—another “crime in the name of liberty.” We hope the defenders of liberty are satisfied, and that the following significant words will on all future occasions shame them into silence:—“We may say further that the House of Commons, in the Acts of 1879 and 1888, did not adopt the more stringent views of the committee of 1872 as to the compulsory commitment to retreats of inebriates. These views are confirmed in a remarkable degree by the evidence of witnesses examined by us, including medical men of eminence, police magistrates, and persons having experience in the management of inebriates’ homes, or having devoted special attention to the subject.”<sup>1</sup>

JAMES HALPIN.

#### A MEDLEVAL COMPENDIUM OF THEOLOGY.

WHEN the student of theology first turns from a modern text-book to consult the works of some mediæval master, he may well be surprised to find such a vast difference in the size and shape of the two books. It is a far cry from the ponderous tomes of the old schoolmen and their followers of the sixteenth century to the modest octavo manuals which contain what must surely be considered the irreducible minimum of dogmatic theology. Sometimes, it is true, the difference is apparent rather than real. A long row of smaller volumes may take the place of a solitary folio; and on the score of convenience, at least, there is something to be said in favour of this change of form. But it is a different matter when a great subject which in happier days would have been treated in the full broad expanse of many folios is now “cribbed, cabined, confined,” in the choking atmosphere of an octavo compendium.

<sup>1</sup> Report, page 1, clause 4.

We are far from denying that such handy volumes have a real value of their own, so long as they are not allowed to usurp the place of larger and fuller works. An index is a useful guide to the contents of a book, and a map may help us to find our way in a vast city; but taken by themselves they would only give us a very superficial knowledge of their subjects. In much the same way the scientific *Compendium* offers the student a convenient clue to the contents of the rich literature, which might else bewilder him by its very abundance, and gives him what may be called a bird's-eye view of the country he is approaching. But it can hardly be expected to do much more than this. The mischief is that in the present age the reader too often confines his attention to a mere compendium, and thinks that he has finished his studies when he has barely begun them. In this way the little book is able to do great harm, and bears out the old saying, *compendia sunt dispendia*. Nevertheless these manuals have their use, and help the hard-pressed student to derive greater profit from other and larger works. For this reason we may well be thankful to the ingenious writers to whom we are beholden for these unpretending primers of theology. It might even seem at first sight as though we had an advantage over our fathers in this respect. Their great works are still open to us, though we may have none of our own to set beside them. And, it may be urged, they, in their turn, had nothing to compare with the compendious handbooks of modern theologians. But when we come to look at the matter more closely, we find that the early schoolmen were fully aware of the need of some such brief sketches or summaries of theological teaching, and they have left us more than one compendium that for brevity and terseness may well challenge comparison with any of the present day.

That masterpiece of mediæval theology, the *Summa* of St. Thomas, is in some sort a compendium, as its very name seems to imply. To readers of this degenerate age it may appear a somewhat lengthy work; but, for all that, its brevity is not the least of its many merits. And those who are familiar with the saint's other writings can readily see

that in this one he is careful to keep within comparatively narrow bounds. What would its length have been had the various articles been cast on the broader lines of the *Quæstiones Disputatæ*? But St. Thomas was not content with this relative brevity, and he has left us another work, which is a veritable compendium in the modern sense. Like the *Sacram* itself, this was, unfortunately, never completed; but there is quite enough to let us take the measure of the whole work, and to show us that the great schoolmen could, when so minded, be as brief as any modern compiler. We might fairly take this valuable *opusculum* as a specimen of its class; but the *Compendium Theologicæ Veritatis*, found among the works of St. Bonaventure, is in many ways still more remarkable and full of interest. This quaint little manual of mediæval divinity is so little known at the present day that we need make no apology for offering our readers some account of its character and contents.

In spite of the well-known warning of the *Imitation*, the first question we naturally ask concerning any book is, "Who wrote it?" The question, so easily asked, is often a hard one to answer. Such is assuredly the case with the *Compendium of Theological Truth*. It has been ascribed in turn to most of the great masters of the mediæval schools. Thus we find it included in Jammy's fine edition of the whole works of Albertus Magnus, published at Lyons in 1651; others, as we have seen, attribute it to St. Bonaventure; while there are some who claim it for St. Thomas or Aegidius Romanus. This fact is surely an unmistakable tribute to the powers of the unknown author. An unsound or worthless book could hardly pass muster for so long a time as the work of these masters of Israel. But though the book is by no means unworthy of St. Bonaventure or Albertus, and we should be sorry to see it omitted from future editions of their works, there seems good reason for adopting the view of the best recent authorities, that it is from some other hand. It is possibly the production of some immediate disciple of one of those great teachers, some follower who had caught something of his master's spirit, and compiled the little book with the help of his large commentaries. The writer



himself says as much in his preface: "de magnorum Theologorum scriptis breve Compendium colligere dignum duxi."

We may say this, without venturing to decide the much-disputed question of the author's name or nationality, or even attempting to solve the further problem as to the identity of the "Brother Thomas" to whom St. Antoninus ascribes the book. English readers may be glad to find that there is some reason for thinking that this is their countryman the Dominican, Thomas of Sutton. On the other hand, Bonetti maintains that the saint is really speaking of the Franciscan Brother, Peter Thomas.<sup>1</sup> Whatever may be said on this matter, we may safely agree with the Roman editor of St. Bonaventure when he concludes his notice of the controversy in the following words: "Quisquis ejus sit auctor, Compendium hoc studiosis Theologiæ utile valde est, et quantum patitur angustia Compendii satis copiosum."<sup>2</sup> The last phrase draws our attention to one of the chief merits of this little book—the amazing wealth of matter which is contained within its comparatively narrow bounds. In this respect, indeed, it may fairly claim the foremost place among all compendiums, ancient or modern. There are some which surpass it in point of mere brevity, such as, for instance, the *Breviloquium* and the *Centiloquium* of St. Bonaventure. In the Roman edition the former fills fifty-three pages, and the latter forty-four; while the *Compendium* before us occupies a hundred and fourteen, or considerably more than both the others taken together. And there are very possibly some works of the present age which have the same doubtful advantage. But then the *Compendium Theologicæ Veritatis* contains a

<sup>1</sup> *Prodromus ad Opera Omnia S. Bonaventuræ*, page 689. On the claims of Thomas of Sutton and Hugh of Strassburg, see Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, tom. i., page 464, &c. The argument drawn from the mention of England in the *Compendium*, lib. ii., c. 10, is certainly ingenious, and reminds one of Wadding's skilful use of the fact that Scotus makes an incidental reference to St. Patrick. The *Admonitio Prævia* of De Rubeis, in the Venice edition of St. Thomas, vol. xix., may be consulted with advantage on this question of the authorship of the *Compendium Theologicæ Veritatis*.

<sup>2</sup> *S. Bonaventuræ Opera*, Romæ, 1596, tom. 7, Append., page 731.

fund of varied information for which we may look in vain in any kindred manuals, or, for the matter of that, in many theological and philosophical works of large growth. It must be borne in mind that the book was compiled long before the time when moral theology was separated from dogmatic, and treated as a distinct science. Hence it naturally deals with both departments: and may be said to represent the mediæval equivalent of Gury's *Manual* combined with that of Hurter or Dalponte. The comprehensive view of the old schoolmen took in all this field at one glance; and let us add, a good deal more besides. Readers of St. Thomas do not need to be reminded that many questions of pure philosophy and mental science are very fully treated in his *Sum of Theology*. In this direction, the little work before us goes yet further than the comprehensive *Opus Magnum* of the Angelic Doctor. Like the *Breviloquium* of St. Bonaventure, the *Compendium* is divided into seven books.

The following titles will give a general notion of its contents:—I. *De Natura Dei*; II. *De Operibus Conditoris*; III. *De Corruptela Peccati*; IV. *De Christi Humanitate*; V. *De Gratiarum Sanctificatione*; VI. *De Sacramentorum Virtute*; VII. *De Ultimis Temporibus*. These correspond with more or less exactness to the following treatises in a modern course of theology:—1. *De Deo Uno*, and *De Deo Trino*; 2. *De Deo Creatore*; 3. The greater part of Moral Theology; 4. *De Verbo Incarnato*; 5. *De Gratia*; 6. *De Sacramentis*; 7. *De Nouissimis*. For terse and luminous statement of doctrine, the first book, “On the Nature of God,” is certainly the best of all. It is so short that it might be thought wanting in completeness. Yet even here we meet with some things not to be found in other and more imposing works. Thus is especially the case with the eighth and ninth chapters, which treat of the Holy Spirit, and the charity which He pours abroad in the hearts of the just. The presence of the Holy Spirit Himself as well as the created gift of love, is distinctly taught: “Sed ad fruendum eo, quo fruendum est, requiritur præsentia fruibilis et debita dispositio fruientis: unde requiritur

præsentia Spiritus Sancti, et ejus donum, scilicet, amor, quo inhaereatur ei." At the same time the writer shows us the true meaning of the appropriation of this work of sanctification to the Holy Ghost, when he says that the Holy Ghost is the *exemplar* of our charity. "Alio modo sumitur (charitas) exemplariter, sic etiam Spiritus Sanctus est charitas, qua diligimus Deum, et proximum. Charitas enim, quæ est Spiritus Sanctus, est exemplar nostræ charitatis." Cardinal Franzelin has made good use of this ninth chapter in his fine work on the Trinity. By a curious coincidence it is on this same topic that St. Thomas gives us something in his little *Compendium* which is not to be found elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

The moral portion of the *Compendium* is hardly so full or so satisfactory as the dogmatic, but what there is of it is sound enough and pithily expressed. Opponents of Jansenistic rigorism will appreciate the forcible sentence on lax and strict consciences; both extremes are to be avoided, but the latter is clearly regarded as the greater evil. "Cavenda est conscientia nimis larga, et nimis stricta. Nam prima generat præsumptionem, secunda desperationem . . . Item prima sæpe salvat dammandum, secunda e contra damnat salvandum."<sup>2</sup> Another instance of terse and felicitous language is the distinction made between "a thought of evil" and "an evil thought." The tempter has power to produce the first, but not the second, for only a voluntary thought can be really evil.

But if the first book is in some sense the best, the second, *On the Works of the Creator*, is undoubtedly the most full of interest. It is here especially that we find that wealth of matter which is one of the writer's main characteristics. Not content with merely setting forth or establishing the necessary doctrine concerning the creation

<sup>1</sup> "Considerandum est, autem, quod cum bonum amatum habeat rationem finis; eo fine autem motus voluntarius bonus, vel malus reddatur: necesse est quod amor quo ipsum summum bonum amatur, quod Deus est, eminentius quandam obtineat bonitatem, quæ nomine sanctitatis exprimitur . . . Convenienter igitur spiritus, quo nobis insinuat amor quo Deus se amat, Spiritus Sanctus nominatur."—*Compendium Theologiæ ad Fratrem Reginaldum*, Pars. i., c. 47.

<sup>2</sup> i. 52.

of all things by God, he goes on to give his readers something like a detailed account of the visible universe and its contents. Bearing in mind the somewhat fictitious nature of mediæval physics, we may say that the result is a veritable treatise *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*. In the course of a few crowded pages we get a brief but comprehensive view of the natural philosophy which held the field in the thirteenth century. The whole teaching of the mediæval school, its *universitas scientiarum*, is brought before us here. All the sciences come together to minister like faithful handmaidens to the mistress and queen of them all. To take a few instances at random, we are told all about the seven heavenly spheres and their movement, the planets and their distance from the earth and the sun, the signs of the Zodiac, and even the names and natures of the various winds. Those who adopt what may be called the Augustinian theory of evolution, will be glad to see what the writer has to say on the subject of the *rationes seminales*. This comes, by the way, in the first book, where he is explaining the difference between miracles *contra naturam* and those which are only *præter naturam*. As an instance of the latter class, he mentions the changing of the rod into a serpent, which, though in fact miraculous, might have happened by the operation of nature. “Sed præter naturam sunt, quæ fiunt ordine simili naturæ, non tamen per principium naturæ, ut in imitatione virgarum in serpentes; quia illud potuisset fieri ordine naturæ per longam putrefactionem, ut patet per ea, quæ fiunt secundum rationes seminales; veruntamen quia non fuit ibi operatio naturæ, miraculum fuit.”<sup>1</sup>

But the most remarkable part of the second book is that which deals with human physiology, psychology, and phrenology. These curious chapters excited the admiration of Frederick Ozanam, who made good use of the *Compendium* in his *Dante et la Philosophie Catholique au 13<sup>me</sup> Siècle*. But that excellent work is itself in some danger of being forgotten, and is probably little known to the readers of the



present generation. Following in the track of the other schoolmen, and of St. John Damascene before them, the author of the *Compendium* tells us which portions of the brain are the seats or organs of the various internal senses. Thus, in the thirty-sixth chapter, he says of the *Census Communis*: “Haec virtus in anteriori parte cerebri ponitur, in loco, ubi concurrunt nervi sensitivi quinque sensuum, qui locus medullosus est et humidus.” In the chapters that follow, he gives local habitation to the *Vis Imaginativa*, *Vis Aestimativa*, *Phantasia*, and finally, *Memoria (sensitiva)*. It is worthy of note that he makes use of this teaching in the course of his sixth book when he is explaining the different sacramental unctions. “In Baptismo fit unctio in vertice, ad signandum fidei susceptionem, quia vertex est locus cellulae rationalis. In Confirmatione fit in fronte, ad significandum audaciam confessionis: cujus impedimentum est timor, et verecundia, quae specialiter manifestatur in pallore vel rubore frontis ex propinquitate cellulae imaginalis.”<sup>1</sup> The reference to the *cellula rationalis* seems to stand in need of some explanation, and as the *Compendium* itself does not furnish it, we may give the following passage from the *Summa de Creaturis* of Albertus Magnus:—“Dicendum, quod intellectus dicitur esse in media cellula et in spiritu mediae cellulae, non quod sit actus illius corporis, sed quia species abstrahit a phantasmatibus, quae ut in vehiculo sunt in spiritu illius cellulae.”<sup>2</sup> It is likely enough that in this portion of his *Compendium*, the writer is largely indebted to the works of the great Dominican, who has treated these matters at considerable length, both in the aforesaid *Summa* and in his *Commentaries on Aristotle*. But even the voluminous *Doctor Universalis* has apparently neglected the philosopher’s treatise on physiognomy. Chapters lviii. and lix. in our author’s second book are thus, in all probability, the most complete account of this curious subject in the literature of the mediæval schools. The modern reader who betakes himself to this work in search of theological teaching may well be surprised to learn that,

<sup>1</sup> vi. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Pars. i., qu. 59, ad 1, rat. in contra.

to take an instance, ears which are prominent and very large signify stolidity, generosity, and imprudence. In like manner, very small ears denote malignity, while oblong narrow ears are said to be tokens of envy. After thus going through the various features, and attaching more or less invidious meanings to their size or form, the author proceeds to give some rules for combining the signs, and shows which are to be regarded as the most important. It is well to add that here, as well as in another passage where he speaks of the influence of the stars, he takes care to explain that such natural propensity or external influences cannot hinder the freedom of the will which is always able to rise superior to them all.

It may, perhaps, be said that in all this pseudo-scientific matter the writer of the *Compendium* does but minister to our amusement, and has nothing to teach us. We venture to think otherwise. Even those chapters which are most full of errors, or of harmless absurdities, may be said to convey a great and most-needed lesson. The old schoolman plainly saw, and felt that all things come from God—nature as well as man; and his zeal for heavenly lore did not make him heedless of the lower things of earth and the science of the physicist, such as it was in his day. It would be well if we could say as much of all theologians of a later age. Why should we abandon the absolute and imperfect physical science of Aristotle without putting something better in its place? After all, each fresh discovery or advance in the field of knowledge gives us a clearer view of the wondrous order and harmony of the works of God, and adds a new chapter to the treatise *De Deo Creatore*.

It is not only in the non-theological passages that the work is occasionally capable of improvement in point of accuracy. This is surely no matter of surprise in the case of a work written in the thirteenth century. Fresh light has been thrown everywhere upon one doctrine since that time, and questions once disputed have been set at rest for ever. This is particularly the case with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which is the only subject on which our author is guilty of serious error. But in this matter he

is accompanied by some of the chief theologians of that period.

On the whole, this little book may be said to give a fair and faithful summary of the mediæval theological science. And it might well serve to remove some popular superstitions concerning the problems which occupied the scholastic doctors. The famous question,

“ Whether angels, in moving from place,  
Pass through the intermediate space,”

is very briefly touched upon, and another equally notorious problem on the relations of angels to space is not so much as mentioned. On the other hand, we meet with many sound practical maxims, and a goodly array of facts patiently brought together. But it is not only among the enemies of the early schoolmen that mistaken or inadequate notions too commonly prevail. Even those who admit the value of their system of philosophy, and hold them in honour, are sometimes rather shy of reading their works. Such men are very commonly under the impression that the schoolmen are dry, formal, and cold; and if we look for warmth of feeling or expression we must betake ourselves to the early fathers instead. Now, it is quite true that many parts of the scholastic writings are open to this objection. The treatise *De Principio Individuationis*, for instance, is neither very inspiring nor very devotional reading. But, after all, these dry disputations, important as they are, do not by any means make up the whole of scholastic literature. The same writers, and often enough in the selfsame works, have also left us many pages of singular beauty, which echo the music of the early fathers, and glow with their living fire. No one can read much in the larger works of St. Thomas and his great compeers without coming upon such bright and tender passages in the midst of much hard thought and plain sober speech. And who can read them without feeling their charm? But those who only know the schoolmen by the extracts from their writings found in most modern text-books and compendiums, are deprived of all this; and it is no wonder if they are apt to think the great scholastic doctors

dry and abstract and cold. It is, perhaps, only natural that such devotional or eloquent passages should be omitted from brief dogmatic manuals. Some of these do, indeed, give us a few jewels from medieval writers: but they could hardly contrive a system of quotation which would do justice to this side of the scholastic writings. Now, it is by no means the least merit of the present *Compendium* that it brings out this feature of mediæval theology in a very special manner. With all his dogma, and morals, and philosophy, and natural science, the writer finds room for spiritual teaching and devotion. For example, he tells us that the study of virtue is to be preferred to that of wisdom, among other reasons, because it is the safer, and at the same time the more honourable of the two. "Ratione securitatis, quia securius est esse bonum, quam esse philosophum. Ratione honestatis, quia major gloria est sequi Deum, quam Aristotelem."<sup>1</sup> The closing words of the chapter that follows may be cited as an instance of felicitous expression. "Humilitas Deo subicit, poenitentia reducit, justitia deducit, obedientia conducit, patientia perducit, perseverantia introducit, puritas jungit, charitas Deo unit." The quaint and the practical are sometimes found in combination. Thus, we have the uprightness of the human body given as a motive for moral rectitude: "quia indecens valde est in recto corpore curvum habere animum."<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere we are told that we merit by adverbs rather than by verbs:—

"In præsenti meriti præsertim adverbis verbis."

We must not forget to mention the abundance of well-chosen Scriptural quotations which further enhance the value of the *Compendium*. The author is especially happy in the use of the sacred text in illustrating liturgical symbolism. He compares the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction, to the three-fold anointing of David; and likens the seven Orders to the steps of Solomon's throne. At first sight the latter comparison looks like of a slip of memory, for the steps were forty and seven. But he evidently

<sup>1</sup> v. 9.

<sup>2</sup> v. 37.



means to say that the priesthood is the throne itself, and the lower Orders the six steps leading up to it. In connection with this, we may add that the author, following in the track of Durandus, shows how it may be said that our Lord Himself exercised the office of all the Orders: viz., that of the Ostiarius, in casting the unworthy out of the Temple; the lector's office, when He read from Isaias; the acolyte's, in saying "I am the light of the world;" the sub-deacon's, at the washing of the feet; and the deacon's, in giving Communion. The others are sufficiently obvious.

Let us conclude this notice with one of those eloquent passages which give the last touch to this faithful picture of mediæval theology, and quicken it with the fire of devotion. "God is in the faithful soul as a bridegroom in his chamber, a king in his kingdom, a tower in a fortress, a master in the schools, a fountain in the gardens, light in the darkness, a treasure in a field, wine in the cellar, a carbuncle set in gold: or, as the manna in the ark, a seal on the parchment, medicine in a chest; as a harp in a banquet, an image in a mirror; as the fruit on a tree, the oil in a lamp, a lily in the valley."<sup>1</sup> These words breathe the true spirit of the best and greatest of the schoolmen, in whose writings the fire of heavenly charity is ever blended with the light of theological truth.

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.

<sup>1</sup>i. 17.

## A FEW THOUGHTS ON THE CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION OF CHILDREN.

**H**EARING the confessions of children is one of the most irksome, if not one of the most difficult duties of a confessor. The special difficulty in their case does not always arise from a want of knowledge, nor does it argue any defect of religious instruction. Children who avail themselves of the ordinary opportunities afforded them, are, as a rule, well informed in what for want of a better name might be called the procedure of the confessional; they will ask the priest's blessing with humility; say the *Confiteor* in a manner that is highly edifying; make carefully-worded protestations of sorrow, and tell their sins oftentimes with the precision and accuracy of a theologian.

The difficulties are of a more serious, because of a more fundamental character; they regard the essence of the sacrament itself; they strike at its very existence, and are always a source of the utmost trouble and perplexity to confessors. "Merito," writes Lacroix, "*virī prudentes invidiosum in his difficultatibus apprehendunt. Longe enim facilius est expedire adultos, quam pueros, quia sæpius dubium est in pueris an et quomodo ipsi peccaverunt, an habeant ad absolutionemactus requisitos.*" The learned theologian has certainly not overstated the case, and even a very slight experience in the sacred tribunal supplies sufficient evidence that it is much more difficult to deal in practice with children than with the most hardened sinners. The most hardened sinners will understand the malice of sin: they will appreciate the issues at stake; the principles that regulate the giving or deferring of absolution are clear and well-defined; and in solving individual cases as they occur, little difficulty is experienced by a confessor who has just as much knowledge as will enable him to adjudicate "*supra ea quæ frequentius occurrunt, et de aliis sciat dubitare.*"

The case of children, on the other hand, presents exceptional difficulties. The very weakness of their childish

faculties; the total absence or doubtful presence of sufficient matter; the unmistakable evidences of thoughtlessness and inadvertence peculiar to their age, all culminate in the practical puzzle so tersely expressed by Lacroix: "An et quomodo reipsa peccaverunt, an habeant ad absolutionem actus requisitos."

The writer of the present paper is not presumptuous enough to imagine that he has anything very important to add to what has been already said on the subject. His object is rather to set forth the ordinary difficulties, and bring to bear on their solution the *dicta* of the theologians to whom he happens to have access, together with the fragments of theological principles that have survived the blighting influence of a brief missionary career.

The Sacrament of Penance is from its very institution a judicial process, wherein a penitent becomes his own accuser and submits his moral faults to his confessor, with the object of securing a reconciliatory sentence of absolution. A judgment from its nature supposes a cause on which to adjudicate; and as there can be no judgment without a cause, so there can be no sentence of absolution until some clear and well-defined matter is submitted for adjudication. Sin being the matter of the sacramental judgment, the first duty of the "judex spiritualis" will be to determine the existence of real and formal sin. It matters not that the sin has been already confessed, since the same sin may be the matter of several absolutions, and Benedict XI. strongly recommends the confessing of sins already confessed. "Licet," he says, "de necessitate non sit iterum eadem confiteri peccata, tamen . . . ut eorumdem peccatorum iteretur confessio, reputamus salutare."

Besides sin, or the *materia remota*, there must be also the "dolorosa accusatio et propositum satisfaciendi." Whether these dispositions—acts of the penitent, as they are called—enter the very essence of the sacrament, or are merely conditions in no way affecting the essence, but only the integrity of the sacred rite, is a question about which theologians are divided. The Thomists, on the one side,

maintain that these acts of the penitent form an essential part of the sacrament, and, united with the form, complete the entire judicial process. The Scotists, on the other hand, regard them merely as conditions, and place the essential elements of the sacrament in the sacramental absolution itself. Which opinion is true we cannot tell; and when theologians so distinguished are divided, it would be more than presumption to offer an opinion. In practice, however, it matters little, since Scotists as well as Thomists agree in saying that those acts of the penitent are required even for a valid sacrament.

Under both heads, difficulties of an exceptional nature arise in the confession of children. First of all, with regard to the existence of sin, or the *materia remota*, it may be remarked that their confessions are not always as immaculate, nor the difficulty, consequently, of procuring sufficient matter so insurmountable, as might be supposed from their youth and comparative freedom from temptation. "*Malitia sæpe supplet ætatem*;" and in this age of enlightenment and independence, their practical knowledge in the ways of evil is oftentimes in advance of their religious training. "*E converso*," writes Aertnys, "*inveniuntur etiam, idque non raro in urbibus, pueri mature corrupti in quibus malitia et notitia luxuriæ prævenerunt ætatem et de quibus dici debet tantillus puer et tantus peccator.*"

For children of this description the present phase of the difficulty has no existence. About the sufficiency of the matter submitted for absolution, there can be no room for doubting, and while theologians strongly recommend confessors to impress on their infant minds a great horror of sin ("principis obsta"), there is no reason why in the absence of a "*prudens suspicio indispositionis*," they may not receive sacramental absolution.

Children, on the other hand, whose lives are, practically speaking, immaculate, and from whom, after the most searching examination, nothing in the shape of a moral fault can be elicited, are sometimes to be met with. A good tree bringeth forth good fruit; early religious training and good example of parents exercise a far-reaching



influence on their infant minds, and it is quite possible that, brought up in such happy surroundings, their confessions, for a considerable time after they have attained the use of reason, may supply nothing which can be looked upon with certainty as sufficient matter for the sacraments. Imperfections, neglect of prayer at stated times, and such like, are confessed; but as imperfections are not sins, they are not matter for absolution. Such children, being apparently at least unfit subjects for absolution, the obvious way to treat them would be to dismiss them with a blessing. On the other hand, the very peccability of human nature; the improbability of resisting successfully the temptations that attack them; lengthened absence from confession, together with the special probation required for the reception of the Blessed Eucharist, all combined, suggest the practical doubt "an peccaverunt." The imperfections confessed, although not sinful in themselves, are suggestive of sin; they are very often mixed up with sin, and it is a matter of extreme difficulty to draw the line between what is merely an imperfection and what is a moral fault as well. "*Quamvis enim*," writes Aertnys, "*imperfectio de se non sit peccatum, saepe tamen habet adjunctum peccatum, quod est materia absolutionis.*" And Lehmkühl writes, "*Verum tamen est, saepe in committendo ejusmodi defectu vel imperfectione, latere aliquod peccatum veniale intentionis seu finis leviter mali.*"

A much larger class of children, and one which presents more formidable difficulties, embraces those whose confessions are made up of doubtful matter. It is a well-known fact that even well-informed children entertain most erroneous notions regarding the malice of the sins they confess, and what in others might be regarded as a venial sin, or possibly even as a mortal sin, is probably for them no sin at all. They have never fully appreciated the malice of the sins which they confess, never adverted even *in confuso* to their gravity, and consequently they make their confessions with an ease and apparent tranquillity of conscience which clearly prove they have never realized their objective malice at all. "*Pueri*," writes Lacroix, "*saepe peccant*

et nihil ita tantum, quamvis materia sit gravis, quia hoc quod tantum in rebus tantum apprehendunt esse malum, non advertentes ad gravitatem malitiae."

Even in the most delicate matters, and where it could scarcely be expected, the same error of judgment is discernible. "*Actiones inhonestae puerorum*," writes Aertnys, qui adhuc luxuriæ ignari sunt, plerumque non habenda sunt ut peccata mortalia, quia vel commotionem veneream non habent, et vel hujus malitiam nondum apprehendunt." St. Alphonsus would even say that the fact of children being ashamed to confess their faults, or manifesting an anxiety to keep them a secret, is no sufficient proof that they have realized their gravity: "*Sunt quaedam actiones naturales*," he writes, "*quas manifestare puderet; attamen declarare propterea non tenemur . . . Neque ex eo quod actus secreto facti sunt, inferri concludere licet conscium quem fuisse ejusdem malitiae; quoniam namque faciunt pueri actiones naturales secreto, quamvis non sint peccata.*"

Going to the other extreme, children frequently exaggerate the trivial faults into which they have fallen, and confess as sins, even as grave sins, what are really not sins at all. Such is the horror of sin that has been instilled into their infant minds, that a mite is magnified into a beam, and the slightest transgression of the moral law deemed worthy of eternal punishment. "*Contingit enim aliquando*," writes Renter, "*pueros peccare mortaliter in materia de se levi; quia perpetrari instincti aut a levibus sub poena inferni sunt deterriti.*"

The difficulties arising out of the confessions of children are increased tenfold by reason of the constantly recurring doubts about their dispositions. As the "*Dispensator mysteriorum Dei*," the confessor before administering absolution has to satisfy himself of the presence of the *dolor sensibilis* and the *propositum non peccandi*; and while a judgment of this kind, based, as it is, on premises which can never be fully understood, is from its very nature liable to error, it should at least be formed according to the rules of prudence, and there should be no reasonable suspicion of its correctness. In ordinary circumstances, going to

confession may be taken as a fair indication of proper dispositions, and the very presence of adults in the sacred tribunal is sufficient to create a presumption in their favour. The same may not be said of children. They go to confession simply because they are sent, or because their parents or guardians have made it a rule that it is their duty to do so at certain times. Their presence there too, and the manner in which they comport themselves, so far from creating a presumption in their favour, tend quite the other way, and it is extremely difficult to reconcile their levity of manner and apparent absence of all serious thought with any real desire of making their confessions. The time allotted to preparation—unless indeed a wholesome fear of correction should act as a deterrent—is not unfrequently spent in looking around the church, scanning their neighbour, or perhaps indulging in conversation with some kindred spirit. Their parrot-like confession—made oftentimes with the utmost attention to detail—affords no indication of the true state of the interior; and in many instances it would border on rashness to assume that their juvenile hearts are touched with one pang of sorrow, or that they have any intention of acting otherwise in the future than they have been acting in the past. The nervous twitching of the fingers; the constant pulling at the confessional; the facility with which every question is answered in the affirmative, may not indeed prove conclusively that they have neither appreciated the dignity of the sacred rite, nor have acquired the necessary dispositions, but they are certainly sufficient to raise a doubt in the mind of confessor, and to cause him to hesitate before pronouncing sentence of absolution.

Considering, therefore, the difficulties of their case, it may, we think, be taken for granted that children are not fit subjects, at least for absolute absolution, every time they approach the sacred tribunal; for while it will be the duty of the confessor to procure, as far as in him lies, the necessary matter and dispositions, his efforts will oftentimes prove futile, and there will remain the *suspicio prudens indispositionis* and the *dubium ne exponatur sacramentum periculo multitudinis*.

Lessius, quoted by Lacroix, would say that they may be absolved absolutely, provided they understand what kind of punishment is to be meted out to the wicked, and what kind of reward is reserved for the good. He supposes, of course, that sufficient matter for absolution has been confessed, and their knowledge of future rewards and punishment he regards simply as a test of their capability to acquire the necessary dispositions. Acernys practically adopts the same view. He says that if children confess their sins, answer the questions proposed by the confessor, and appear to realise in some way that they have offended God and are deserving of punishment, there is sufficient reason to conclude that they bring with them the necessary dispositions; or, at least, that they are capable of acquiring them. But, as every person knows, it is much easier to state principles than apply them in practice, and a confessor with his principles cut and dry, and his *signa ordinaria* ready for application to individual cases, will, in forming the *judicium prudens*, always have to fall back on his own observation and diagnosis of human character; for as Gobat, quoted by Lacroix, observes: "Multum prodesse ait cognoscendum maturitatem puerorum confitentium, si confessorius attendat ad vultum et gestus eorum, nam si digitis ludunt in clathris, si confitens respicit alios extra confessionale, si urgetur cum rosario vel pilco suo, signum est exiguae maturitatis."

That conditional absolution may be sometimes administered to children, seems now beyond all controversy. For a long time, indeed, the use of the conditional form under any circumstance was looked upon with suspicion by a large section of theologians, and some went so far as to characterize it as a gross form of superstition which should be extirpated from amongst Catholic practices. Its validity and licity, given a reasonable cause, are no longer a matter of controversy, and it is difficult to conceive why a mode of ministration which provides so liberally for the exercise of the mercy of God, and, at the same time, so effectively safeguards the sacrament, should ever have been called into question at all. Absolution in ordinary circumstances, ought



to be administered absolutely, according to the mode of institution; but, given a just cause, there is no reason why, even in the case of children, it may not be administered subject to condition. "Absolutio," writes Lacroix, "regulariter danda est absolute, ita ut confessarius ordinarius absque justa causa sub conditione absolvens peccet mortaliter." "Sub conditione danda est absolutio, quodcumque est necessitas vel obligatio illius dandae, et periculum faciendi sacramentum nullum, si detur absolute."

Lehmkuhl lays down a rule, which, considering the high character of the author, may be taken as a fair summary of the teaching of the most approved theologians on the subject. "Regula," he writes, "de conditionata absolutione haec est; ut conditionate detur, si (1) gravis est ratio putandam valide proferri non posse sed tamen (2) propter quandam necessitatem aut notabilem utilitatem probabilem, etiam cum dubio securiora tentanda sunt."

The rule laid down by Lehmkuhl may, perhaps, appear somewhat stringent in its requirements, in that it will not permit the ministration of the sacred rite, even when safeguarded by condition, except in circumstances where the necessity is really pressing, or a notable advantage—*notabilis utilitas*—is about to accrue to the penitent. It should, however, be borne in mind that besides the spiritual gain of the penitent, the dignity of the sacrament must also be protected, and its ministration subject to more liberal conditions, might have the evil effect of rendering confessors less careful in the discharge of their important duties.

That the former of the two conditions laid down by Lehmkuhl, "*valide (absolute) proferri non posse*," is frequently verified in the case of children, there can be no reason for doubting; and the question of the use of the conditional form simply comes to this, when in the case of serious doubt as to the matter or dispositions. Is the necessity so pressing or the advantage to be derived so notable, that a confessor may feel secure in departing from the ordinary mode of absolution, and ministering it subject to condition.

Theologians, as usual, are divided in their teaching on this

subject, some adopting a more liberal, and others a more rigorous view. All with whom we are acquainted appear to think it may be administered in time of death; and, indeed, if ever a necessity were truly pressing or a notable advantage to be derived from a sacrament which has for its object the reconciliation of the creature with the Creator, it would undoubtedly be at the extreme moment, when a last opportunity is afforded for making atonement for the misdeeds of life. Pœnal time is another of these occasions on which theologians say conditional absolution may be given to children. St. Liguori, Lessius, Reuter, and a host of others, whose authority is a sufficient guarantee for the correctness of the opinion, recommend it. St. Liguori would even go further, and permit its use on other occasions; Reuter and Aertnys adopt the same opinion, and define the time pretty accurately by saying that it may be given every two or three months.

Relying on the teaching of these authors, whose authority can scarcely be called in question, we feel justified in concluding that in case of serious doubt, such as is described by Calmeland, a confessor may feel secure in administering conditional absolution every two or three months: "*Sacramenta sunt propter homines;*" and considering the exceptional advantages to be derived from this particular sacrament, and the probable loss its privation would entail, five or six times in the year would not be too often to risk its ministration, when safeguarded by a condition.

In interpreting thus liberally the use of the conditional form, theologians, as a rule, suppose a case where the matter submitted for absolution is grave, or at least doubtfully grave. "*Presertim,*" says St. Alphonsus, "*si confessus est aliquod peccatum grave;*" and Reuter has it, "*si sit formulæ prudens ne forte peccet mortaliter.*" Where merely venial faults have been confessed there does not appear to exist the same unanimity of opinion amongst theologians, nor are they so liberal in their permission to use the conditional form. "*Venialia peccata multis aliis modis remitti possunt;*" and, therefore, it is contended where a confession is made up of such faults, the necessity is not

sufficiently pressing, nor the advantage to be derived sufficiently notable, to justify a confessor in using a form which is permissible only in exceptional circumstances. Sporer, quoted by Lacroix, appears to adopt this view. "Nam," he writes, "si doleat de his venialibus, remittuntur per hunc dolorem et benedictionem sacerdotis; si non doleat, male daretur absolutio."

St. Liguori, whose teaching is always safe, would permit, even in these circumstances, the occasional use of the conditional form. Lugo is of the same opinion, and their teaching appears to commend itself to modern theologians. Attrition may, indeed, have the effect of remitting the venial sins confessed; but then there is the probable loss of the sacramental grace—a *notabilis utilitas*—designed by its Divine author as a means of strengthening the soul in its temptations, and preserving it from still greater sins. It may happen too, as Lugo says, that besides the venial faults submitted to the keys, there remains upon the soul some mortal sin the presence of which has escaped the most searching examination, and the effect of the conditional form in such a case might be, besides remitting directly the venial sins confessed, to remit indirectly the mortal sin, which, through no fault of the penitent child, has not been confessed.

Advantages of this kind cannot be overlooked, and without in any way departing from the rigid rule laid down by Lehmkuhl, we feel justified in concluding with Aertnys, that even where merely venial sins have been confessed, it is highly probable that conditional absolution may be given four or five times in the year.

Should a case arise where nothing bearing even the semblance of a venial fault has been confessed, and where it is quite clear no sufficient matter can be forthcoming, we confess we see nothing to justify the use of the conditional form, and we should feel satisfied in dismissing the child so confessing with a blessing.

This paper has already outstepped all rational limits, and yet the writer cannot pretend that he has treated the subject in a way satisfactory even to himself. His attention was

drawn to it by constantly recurring difficulties, and if in any way he has misinterpreted or misunderstood what theologians have got to say on the subject, he has only to apologize to their admirers, and to express the hope that in correcting his error they will give the benefit of their own views on this important subject.

DENIS FLYNN.

### WHO SEN PATRICK WAS NOT.

**I**N the number of the *I. E. RECORD* for September, 1891, an article appears under the heading, "Sen Patrick, Who Was He?" The writer of the article, before going into the proof of his identification, glanced at and refuted the principal theories previously broached on the subject. Dr. Lanigan conjectured that Sen Patrick was our national saint; the Bollandists, that he was nephew to our national apostle; the Irish compilers of the primatial lists of bishops, that he was successor to our national apostle, but according to Dr. Todd, he was only coadjutor bishop; Dr. Moran, that he was an Irishman who, though a Pagan, had been tutor to our apostle in Glastonbury, and, in consequence, received the gift of faith; while the Glastonbury monks maintained that our national apostle, after having laboured for the conversion of Ireland, retired to Glastonbury, and having died, was buried there.

In the July, 1893, number of the *I. E. RECORD* a paper appears, under the heading "Sen Patrick," from the pen of the Very Rev. Albert Barry, C.S.S.R. His theory scarcely differs from that of the Glastonbury writers, save in this, that while he makes Sen Patrick a monk or abbot who laboured in Ireland previous to the mission of our national apostle, they claim him as the national apostle who subsequently became abbot in their monastery. Both theories are based on a document by an alleged St. Patrick, abbot of Glastonbury.

The document on which Father Barry and the



Glastonbury monks ground their theory has been proved to be a forgery. Protestant and Catholic, Irish and British writers, such as Dr. Lanigan, Sir James Ware, and Protestant Archbishop Ussher, have judged the document to be apocryphal. But not resting on their rejection of the Chart of St. Patrick, I undertake to show that it is inconsistent with historic facts. Though the Chart itself is not free from the supernatural element, it is supplemented in the monastic chronicles by the visions of some monks, in proof of St. Patrick having dwelt in Glastonbury, and by the dreams of another monk. But as the learned Redemptorist relies principally on the Chart in proof of his theory, I will confine my comments to it.

This foolish and forged document was given to the world for the first time by William of Malmesbury, and while it is at variance with the whole course of history from the fifth to the twelfth century, it is also self-contradictory. We have only to glance at it to be convinced of its worthlessness, and as it were tedious and unnecessary to give it in full, I shall confine my remarks to a few extracts from it, as follows:—

“I, Patrick, the humble servant of God, was sent by holy Pope Celestine to Ireland in the year of the Incarnation, 425 (1), and I converted (2) the Irish to the way of truth. . . .

“We were thus leading a monastic life according to the rules of the writings of St. Fagan and St. Diruvian, where it is stated that twelve disciples of St. Philip and St. James had built that ancient church in honour of our advocate through the instruction of the blessed Archangel Gabriel, and that the Lord had dedicated that church to the honour of His Mother. . . . St. Fagan and St. Diruvian had besought thirty years’ indulgence from Pope Eleutherius, who sent them there, and I, Brother Patrick, have obtained in my time twelve years’ indulgence from Pope Celestine. . . .

“Taking with me my fellow-monk Wellias from Glastonbury to the summit of a hill . . . we discovered that the aforesaid St. Fagan and St. Diruvian had built an oratory there, through a revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in honour of the Archangel Michael, and that they besought thirty years’ indulgence for all who should piously visit that place in honour of St. Michael. . . .

“And the Lord showed Himself, saying: ‘This shall be a sign to thee and thy brethren that they may believe: thy left arm shall

withor until you shall have made known what thou hast seen to thy brethren dwelling in the monastery underneath. . . .

"And I, Patrick, with the advice of my brethren grant a hundred days' indulgence to all who with good intention fell with axe and hatchet the wood."

1. Now the guilt of forgery is brought home to the writer of this document by his use of the vulgar era for fixing dates. This era referring to our Lord's birth or incarnation came into use only a long time subsequent to the time of Sen Patrick. And additional evidence of forgery is afforded by the use of the figures 425; for it is generally admitted that the use of Arabic numbers was not known in Europe before the end of the tenth century of our era.

2. The alleged Patrick of Glastonbury is made to say that "he converted the Irish." But so far from truth is this statement, that Palladius, sent subsequently by Pope Celestine, did not convert Ireland, but left it to be converted by our national apostle, who, according to the *Book of Armagh*, converted almost all Ireland. Even the authority referred to by Father Barry<sup>1</sup> in proof of the Glastonbury Patrick being identical with Sen Patrick, states that he went as pilgrim to Glastonbury "because he failed to convert them" (the Irish).

3. The charge of forgery is established by reference to the indulgences said to have been granted by Pope Eleutherius. The learned Redemptorist appeals to the authority of Bellarmine for proof of the use of indulgences in the early ages of the Church. But it should be borne in mind that indulgences, like current coin, varied in shape in different ages. There was the apostolic form, there was a form of indulgences peculiar to the era of the martyrs and confessors, and there was a different form of indulgences in the beginning of the ninth century. Now, I make bold to state that the indulgence in the form of thirty years attributed to Pope Eleutherius did not prevail in his time, nor in the time of Pope Celestine. Furthermore, the grant of an indulgence of a hundred days attributed to Brother Patrick, whether ordained or not ordained, is an additional proof of forgery.

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 631.

Father Barry, in building his theory on this forged and inconsistent document, falls into self-contradiction. He implicitly states<sup>1</sup> that our national apostle died in the year 462; and, in page 628, that Sen Patrick died in the year 472; yet, in page 632, he asserts that Sen Patrick died before our national apostle. Does a sound theory require such self-contradiction?

And even though the Chart of the supposed abbot Patrick did not exhibit proofs of forgery in connection with an Irish subject, would it not have been prudent to take account of Irish annalists? Yet Father Barry, strange to say, takes no trouble to reconcile them with his theory. The *Psalter of Cashel*, the *Yellow Book of Lecan*, and the *Book of Leinster* make Sen Patrick not an abbot merely, but Archbishop of Armagh.

Again, a theory is made acceptable in proportion to the facility with which it lends itself to the meeting of objections and the solution of difficulties. Now, the writer of *Sen Patrick* is at no pains to state why he assigns the death of Sen Patrick to the year 472, as asserted by the Glastonbury chronicler, rather than follow either the annals of the Four Masters and of Ulster, which assign the death to the year 457; the annals of Connaught, which assign it to 453; the *Chronicon Scotorum*, to the year 454; the *Book of Armagh*, to the year 461 or 463; or to the *Book of Leinster*, which assigns his death to the reign of Eaoaire, 428-463. All these Irish authorities contradict the Glastonbury chronicles. But these chronicles are not consistent with themselves. For instance, some of them assign to the year 433, others to the year 449, the coming of Sen Patrick to Glastonbury, while Father Barry admits that so early as 431 he was succeeded in Ireland by Bishop Palladius. The truth is that the Glastonbury writers cared more for the renown of their monastery than for accuracy in dates or facts.

If reasonable evidence were forthcoming in proof of them, I should be very willing to accept the supernatural events mentioned in the so-called *St. Patrick's Chart*. But for the

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 632.

that twelve disciples of St. Philip and St. James, over-  
looking St. James's own town (Compostella), and penetrating  
into Glastonbury, had settled there, and, instructed by the  
Archangel Gabriel, built a church there, "which the Lord  
from Heaven dedicated to his mother;" that subsequently  
Pope Eleutherius sent SS. Fagan and Diruvian, who never,  
by the way, appear in the course of history, to this church,  
and granted unusual indulgences at their request; that  
by-and-by, in the fifth century, Brother Patrick, mounting  
the hill overhanging Glastonbury, discovered the remains of  
a church built by the aforesaid SS. Fagan and Diruvian,  
because of a revelation of our Lord, in honour of St. Michael;  
and that they obtained thirty years' indulgence for all who  
would visit it; that our alleged Patrick, in vision during  
sleep, had his arm withered by our Lord till he would  
descend, and tell the brethren below of the honour that  
was to be paid to the Lord in the church on the  
hill, and till he would return again to the mount: for all  
this story what evidence is producible? None, unless  
a forged document written in the eleventh or twelfth  
century.

True to its heading, this paper has been devoted exclu-  
sively to showing "Who Sen Patrick Was Not;" but those  
who may wish to know the judgment of the writer as to  
'Who Was Sen Patrick,' are respectfully referred to the  
September Number, 1891, of the I. E. Record. In that  
paper some half score pages are given to establish the  
identity of Sen Patrick with Palladius. Perhaps I may also  
state that an article headed "The Genesis of Patrick," in  
the I. E. Record for June, 1890, from the present writer,  
cuts away at once, and effectually, though indirectly,  
the ground for a theory on any Patrick in Glastonbury.  
For the aim of this article was to prove that our national  
apostle was called Patrick, because this expressed what his  
original name, *Succat*, signified; that a change of name was  
usual at consecration; that there was only one Patrick in  
Ireland during the fifth century; that in the seventh century  
it came to be believed that our national apostle was conse-  
crated, not by Abbot Amatus, but by Pope Celestine, who



gave him an exchange of name; and that Palladius,<sup>1</sup> who was known to have received consecration from Pope Celestine, and was supposed to have received also the title *Patricius*, was called Patrick, and that no other ecclesiastic in Ireland was called Patrick before the eleventh century. If these views are not well founded, the sooner they are exploded the better; but, if well founded, any theory as to several Patricks, or a second Patrick in the Irish Church during the fifth century, only involves waste of time and energy.

SYLVESTER MALONE.

## “HORÆ LITURGICÆ:” OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL.

### V.

SOME MASSES FROM THE “COMMUNE SANCTORUM.”

COMMON OF MANY MARTYRS MASS: “SAPIENTIAM.”

(St. Eustace and Companions, MM., September 20.)

**T**WO-DAY Holy Church calls upon us to adore “The King of Martyrs,” for we are going to offer the unbloody sacrifice in memory of the witness by their blood-shedding of the love of holy Eustace and his family for Christ their Lord.

The Introit (Eccli. xlv.) is a strain of praise and triumph sung by Holy Church in honour of these holy martyrs; for she keeps the day of their triumph as a special day of joy for herself, and glories in the constancy of her children. “The folk talk of the wisdom of the saints, and the Church sets forth their praise, and their names live for ever and ever” (Ps. xxxii.). “O ye godly, be ye glad in the Lord: praise becometh them that be righteous.” How striking was the wisdom of this holy family guided by their father Eustace! He, a noble and wealthy, a leader of the Roman hosts, and beloved by his master Trajan, was called in the

<sup>1</sup> If Father Barry had seen my latest writings on Palladius, he would not, on my authority, have placed his death at Wigton. *Vide* Malone’s *St. Patrick*, page 95.

midst of his hunting by a wonderful miracle; and he forsook at once all the world could give, and accepted the Lord's gracious invitation to pursue the prey of life eternal. Eustace, with the new light which flooded his soul in this the hour of his conversion, knew "that a man's enemies be those of his own household" (St. Matthew x. 36); so he, like a wise hunter, set snares of "the cords of Adam" (Osee xi. 4), and "with bands of love" (*ibid.*) took in the toils of Christ his wife and two little children. The wisdom of the saints appears herein, for St. Eustace was forewarned by God that many sorrows awaited him, and that he was to be tried in all he held most dear. Poverty came to him in place of riches, contempt and distrust in place of the honours he had enjoyed, his loving wife and children were torn from him, and he himself was forced for a time to go into exile. The name of St. Eustace lives in God's Church as one of the most greatly tried of His servants. He was the Christian Job, and added to the crown won by patience the extra aureole of the martyr's glory. And now, they who sought for God and His justice join in the song of triumph which the ransomed, "the godly, and the righteous," sing before the throne of God. In their mouth the song of praise is fittingly found, for they have shown their love of God even as He has shown His love for us, in laying down their life for their Friend (St John xv. 13).

In the Collect we pray through the martyr's prayers that we too may be made glad in their fellowship, and rejoice in the same never-ending happiness which they now enjoy as "the reward of their labour." The Epistle (Wisdom v.) is a description of the joys eternal St. Eustace and his family have now in heaven. Listen! "The righteous live forever, and their reward is with the Lord, and He hath care of them." The trial is over, the Red Sea of their blood is passed. He who but now has led the army of his earthly King on to victory, and has once more been locked in the arms of his long-lost wife and children, in the hour of his triumph does not deny his Heavenly King, but together with his family boldly confesses Him in the midst of the enemies of His name. The doom is pronounced, and he who had been

the saviour of his country is now condemned with his family to death. The way to heaven is for them a cruel way, but with hymns of joy they all ascend to their torture, and "they rejoice that they are counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus" (Acts v. 41). In a few moments "the gold is tried by the fire" (Zach. xiii. 9) and the crown is won. They go forth from the sight of Trajan into the presence of Jesus, from the frown of the angry Emperor into the loving smile of the Eternal King. Eternal life have they got at the cost of much tribulation here below, and for ever shall they reign in the home of God. "They shall be His people, and God Himself shall be their God" (Apoc. xxi.). For St. Eustace and his family all tears are wiped away, mourning and weeping and sorrow are no more, for "God hath care of them." They counted the promised rewards of the heathen as so much dung, for they looked for the crown of beauty from the right hand of the Lord. "When they entered into the dark valley of death," His right hand did cover them, and His holy arm did defend them;" so they feared not, but sang their song of praise undismayed, "and the breath of the fire had no power over their bodies, nor was a hair of their heads singed, nor did the smell of the fire pass on them" (Dan. iii. 27). The old warrior, Eustace, put on zeal as his armour in the last battle, and justice as a breast-plate, and true judgment in place of a helmet; with righteousness as an invincible shield did he protect his loved ones, and helped them to overcome "on account of the testimony of the Lord and His fatherly laws;" for in this holy family "there was always one spirit and one faith" (vii. Responsory).

In the Gradual (Ps. exxiii.) we have an echo of the martyrs' song, which they chanted on this the day of their escape; and the old love of the chase colours St. Eustace's words. "As a bird out of the net of the fowler, so does our soul escape. The snare is broken, and we are free; for in the name of the Lord, Who hath made heaven and earth, was our help." Because they had escaped from the toils of the Evil One do they sing joyful Alleluias, and "feast and rejoice, and are made glad in the sight of God."

In the Gospel St. Luke vi. the Evangelist seems to have had before his mind St. Eustace and his family, so wonderfully does it recall our saint's history as we have it in the *Procyon*. "Jesus coming down from the mountain stood in a grassy place." On that day when Eustace, Placidus, as he was then called, went forth to hunt, the Divine Huntsman Himself came down from His holy hill, and stood face to face with His creature in a grassy place in the forest. There did He speak to His servant, and lealed his soul, and the virtue went forth and lealed all the family of the huntsman, himself taken captive and stricken with the darts of Divine love. There in that grassy place did the Master tell His servant of what great things he had to undergo, and cheered him with His sweetest consolations. He told him that poverty was to be a blessedness unto him, for it was to be the source of his eternal riches; his tears would be blessed, for they should be turned into everlasting joy; and the cruel deeds of men would be only so many means for him to reach his reward. And when all these things came to pass and the waters of affliction broke on his soul, St. Eustace and his family raised up their hearts, for they knew the tempest would not shipwreck them, more fiercely as it would, for God was faithful, and would bring such issue about that their bark would, by the very force of the storm, "be brought into the haven where they would be" (Ps. cvi. 30).

The Offertory (Ps. cxlix.) reflects on the exceeding reward our Lord promises in the Gospel. The martyrs rejoice in glory, "white stoles are given to each of them . . . and they rest for awhile till their fellow-servants and their brethren who are to be slain, even as they, shall be filled up" (Apoc. vii. 11). The high praises of God are in their mouth," and they say to Him "How long, O Lord (Holy and True), dost Thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (*ibid.*). It is not the vengeance of anger St. Eustace and his family call for, but for the vengeance of love, for "the high praise of God." Who has reconciled us who were heretofore His enemies to Himself in the blood of His Son? The old longing for the chase still holds possession of St. Eustace's heart, but it is now no



longer the wild brute beast he hunts, but the human soul ; not to destroy, but to tame ; not for himself, but for the use of his King. This we pray for in the Secret that, through the saints' prayers and the power of the sacrifice we are about to offer, the gifts of our devotion may be pleasing to God as was the spoil of Esau's hunting to Isaac, "savoury meat, such as he loved" (Gen. xxvii. 4).

During the tribulation through which the saints passed, in the hour of their poverty, exile, and separation, and in that most awful trial of all in the day of their earthly exaltation, the gracious words of the Communion must have sounded in their hearts. "I say to you, my friends, fear not them that persecute you." And how can we, descendants of martyrs, and who have in our heart the very "King of Martyrs" Himself, and who are on such terms of love with Him that He calls us too His friends, how can we fear them that seek our hurt ? "Yea, though we walk in the midst of the valley of the shadow of death, we will fear no evil" (Ps. xxii.), "for He, our Jesus, the King of kings and Lord of lords, clothed with a garment that is sprinkled with blood and crowned with many crowns : He, Whose name no man knoweth but Himself, and yet is called the Word of God" (cf. Apoc. xix.), He is even now with us in the closest union, body to body and soul to soul. So we pray in the Post-Communion that, holy Eustace and his family uniting their prayers with us, the corporal union which exists in Holy Communion may work its full effect in our souls, and become, as it is ordained to be, the pledge of never-ending life in heaven.

THE COMMON OF A MARTYR : THE MASS "IN VIRTUTE."

(St. Wenceslaus, M., September 28.)

The God, Who is His soldiers' lot and crown and reward, we in lowly prayer do ask on this day of the martyr Wenceslaus' triumph to deign to release us, His servants, from all things hurtful. (Cf. *Hymn. ad Mat.*) In this spirit we come to adore the King of Martyrs, Who is magnified in the victory of this puissant warrior, who, following in the footsteps of the Father's only Son, has won the battle, and

as a victor reigns in the possession of joys eternal (cf. *Hymn. ad Laud*).

The Introit (Ps. xx.) is from one of our matin psalms composed by the sweet singer of Israel in thanksgiving for one of his victories. It is full of reference to the great victory of our Lord, the King of Martyrs, and so is a fitting source whence the Church can borrow her song of victory for the martyr " who was made like to Jesus in His death, and in the fellowship of His sufferings " (Phil. iii. 10). " In Thy strength, O Lord, shall the just man rejoice : and greatly shall he exult in Thy salvation : Thou hast given to him his heart's desire. For Thou hast presented him with the blessings of sweetness, and hast set upon his head a crown of the precious stone."

St. Wenceslaus' early life gives us one side of the picture suggested by the Introit, and his martyrdom completes it in its truer sense. God did, indeed, prevent him with all blessings, which contained all manner of sweetness, and from his earliest ages set his feet in the way that was to lead to his Calvary. He lost his father at an early age, and had to be taken from his mother's charge, for she was a wicked Gentile woman : so his father's mother, the holy Ludmilla, was the means God used for preventing him with the blessings of sweetness, for she brought him up in the practice of all virtue, and taught him how sweet the Lord is, and how easy and pleasant is His yoke. Thus strengthened he set out along the more difficult path of the counsels, and rejoiced and was made exceeding glad in the power of God's grace, for thereby he obtained what was his heart's desire ; that is to say, the favour of preserving intact his purity amidst all the perils of his situation. God set upon his head the ducal crown as a promise to him of the future crown after which he was striving. Then, again, was his heart's desire granted to him, and again with the blessings of sweetness in which others now shared ; for he had, as sovereign, full scope for all those works of charity for the relief of the orphan, the widow, and the stricken. He who had the crown set upon his head made himself the servant of all his subjects ; and to none did he show such

reverence as to God's priests. For, if in the poor and afflicted he saw so many images of Jesus Christ, in the priests he saw our Divine Redeemer Himself; for they act and speak in his own Sacred Person. He loved that source of all sweetness and blessings, the Most Holy Eucharist, and esteemed it his highest privilege to prepare with his own hands the bread and wine to serve for the Adorable Sacrifice. His love for Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament was so burning that it melted the frozen snow whereon his saintly footsteps had fallen, when at night he kept his vigils in the place where his Lord lay. But there awaited for him higher things and greater blessings of which we shall read further on in the Mass.

In the Collect, which is proper, Holy Church prays to her spouse that He who gave the palm of victory to the martyr Wenceslaus, and in place of his earthly crown did set upon his head a crown of the precious stone, would defend us from all ill, and one day give us the happiness of rejoicing in his holy company. This prayer she offers through the infinite merits of her martyred Head, Jesus Christ, whose footsteps our saint followed.

The Lesson (Wisdom chap. x.) is a prophecy of our saint's life and death, drawn by the hand of the Holy Ghost. Let us take a few passages. In truth was he "a just man, and by the right ways did the Lord lead him." He was led by the ways of chastity, poverty, sufferings, charity, love of the Blessed Sacrament, meekness, and prayer. "The kingdom of God was shown to him," and he realized the Master's words that it was already within him (cf. St. Luke xvii. 21), and that by meekness and poverty of spirit was he to "possess the land" (cf. St. Matthew vi. 3, 4). His life shows how deeply he had studied "the science of the saints," and he was thereby "made honourable in all his labours" for God and man. When traitors "by fraud tried to overcome him, the Lord was with him, and shielded him from his enemies, and gave him the victory." "For He had given His angels charge over him" (cf. Ps. xc.), and they kept him safe in battle, and forbade his antagonist to strike. When troubles pressed on him, and "he went down into the pit"

of suffering, God was with him, and did not desert him when in the hands of the wicked; angels kept guard over him, and brought to him "the true sceptre of the kingdom," the holy Cross, with which "he was to have a power against them that opposed him." By the rapid vengeance which befell his murderers "they were shown to be liars;" and now in place of an earthly glory the Lord, our God, has made him one of the princes of His own kingdom, and has clothed him with a brightness which never grows dim. "His heart's desire has been granted to him, and greatly does he exult in his salvation."

The Gradual (Ps. viii.) comments on the happiness of St. Wenceslaus, who feared the Lord, and set his heart to fulfil the Commandments. He is powerful in heaven, and blessed upon earth for all the favours he obtains for us by his prayers. Then we are taken back in the versicle to the words of the Introit and the eternal reward St. Wenceslaus now enjoys. "Thou hast set upon his head a crown of the precious stone, Alleluia!" What is this precious stone (*de lapide pretioso*) of which the martyr's crown is made?<sup>1</sup> We may, perhaps, find the meaning in the Epistle to the Church of Pergamus (Apoc. ii. 17). "To him that overcometh I will give the hidden manna, and will give to him a white stone; and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it." This most precious white stone is the reward then given "to him that overcometh;" and it is evidently from this *stone* that the crown of St. Wenceslaus is made, for he hath overcome, and is victorious. There is a deep meaning in this white stone, which is the martyr's glory. Perchance we may get a little light on it from the Gospel of St. Matthew (xiii. 12), where our Divine Master says: "What *man* is there among you, of whom if his son ask *bread*, will he reach him a *stone*?" Now, when we ask for *bread* our earthly father, the *man*, gives us, indeed, the meat which perisheth (St. John vi. 27); but our Heavenly Father gives us as our supersubstantial bread (St. Matthew vi. 11) the white stone, and out of

<sup>1</sup> We are following the words of the Missal, and are not touching upon the questions of Hebraisms.



that stone, as He is the Son of God, He maketh bread (cf. iv. 3), even the Bread of Life which was according to that other Scripture, "the Stone which the builders rejected" (St. Matthew xxi.). On this white stone then, which is the bread God gives to His sons, is a name written which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it, for it is "in the breaking of bread" that we *know* our Master, and all the love that is meant by His name (cf. St. Luke xxiv. 35). So now we can "gather up the fragments" of these thoughts, and understand that the precious stone, which is the martyr's crown, is none other than the most Adorable Sacrament; and this is peculiarly appropriate to the martyr. For, as Holy Church sings in the words of the Angelical, the Sacred Banquet is "the memorial of Christ's Passion." Now holy Wenceslaus drank deeply of the cup whereof his Master drank. It is also "the pledge of future glory," for it is the cause of our rising again into immortal life. (Cf. St. John vi.) So it is fitting that he, who had such a loving reverence for the Blessed Sacrament, should have set upon his head as his special glory a crown of beauty made out of his communions, wherein he found "the strength in which he rejoiced."

The Gospel (St. Matthew xvi.) gives us our Blessed Lord's teaching on martyrdom; and the Breviary tells us how faithfully St. Wenceslaus put into practice what he learnt in the school of Christ. Above all things did he desire to follow Him; and he knew that meant the Cross. To follow the Master we must tread in His footsteps, and they lead to Calvary where He went. So by "bearing about in his body the dying of Jesus" (2 Cor. vi. 10), in the practice of mortification, St. Wenceslaus was counted worthy to shed his blood for the testimony of God. Wealth, position, honour were nought to him; nay, even life itself he counted as of no value compared with that "salvation" which was his heart's desire, and in which he, now that it is attained, so greatly rejoices (cf. Introit). So right willingly did he lay down his life for Christ's sake and by dying to himself got in exchange Christ to live in him. Happy exchange! from a mortal to an immortal life; from self to

Christ! In the latter day, when the Lord comes again with His angels, He shall render to St. Wenceslaus, in the sight of all, the reward of his works; and what that reward is, we see in the Offertory.

"With glory and honour hast Thou crowned him, and hast placed him over all the works of Thy hands." (Ps. viii.) What a dazzling picture of eternal life! *Sursum corda!* There amid the ransomed from all nations for ever stands St. Wenceslaus; "on his head many diadems" (Apoc. xix. 12), for he is crowned with the martyr's laurel-wreath, the symbol of his victory: he has the crown of justice, for he loved the coming of Christ (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8), and shines with that of the prophets (cf. Dan. xii. 3); while the resplendent diadem of perpetual virginity draws him near to the Lamb whom he "followeth whithersoever He goeth" (Apoc. xiv. 4); and above them all, fairer and choicer than any of his crowns, is that one of the Precious Stone which has made him what he is! See the glory of that vesture of beauty which clothes him; it is a "garment sprinkled with blood," a garment "made white and clean in the Blood of the Lamb" (Apoc., *loc. cit.*); truly a fitting robe for one "whom the King delighteth to honour;" for it is His own "regal robe" (Esther vi. 7, 8), and St. Wenceslaus has been found "worthy of Him, and hath laid down his life for his Friend" (Evangel.) Now, he sees his Master face to face, and is likened to Him, for he sees Him as He is (cf. 1 St. John iii. 2). Now, at last, is he come "to the Mount Sion and to the city of the Living God . . . to the company of many thousands of angels, and to the Church of the first-born . . . and to God the Judge of all . . . and to the spirits of the just men made perfect . . . and to Jesus" (Heb. xiii. 22, 23). Oh, how glorious is his reward! how great is his glory! "for ever with the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 17). And over all His works hath the Lord set him, for he is become most powerful in our behalf. If the King of Martyrs ever lives making intercession for us (cf. Heb. vii. 25) by lifting up His five most sacred wounds before His Father's face, surely St. Wenceslaus, in the exercise of the principedom given him by God, has only to show the "marks

on his body," which are the Lord Jesus's, for He bore them in the person of one of His members (cf. Gal. vi. 17), and he will surely move the Eternal to grant his request. That he may do so now for us, and offer our gifts and prayers to the Most High, and obtain that we may be cleansed by the heavenly mysteries we are about to celebrate, and be heard for the sake of Jesus, this is what Holy Church prays for in the Secret.

And now when the Sacrifice is finished, and we are united to the Sacred Victim, He speaks in the Communion (St. Matthew xvi.) words of the deepest weight. Sharing as we do His Eternal Priesthood, in which he is both Priest and Victim, we are bound also to be victims as well as sacrificers. We must be one with Him in perfect union, and must be offered along with Him. He demands it, and it is an integral part of our priesthood. Hence He says to us "ye My priests, who have pledged yourselves in your ordination to follow Me, lo! the road My martyr Wenceslaus trod after Me is also the road for you. Deny yourselves! All things are lawful, but not all are expedient (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 12) for one who is a victim together with Me. Take up *your* cross, and *your* cross is *My* cross, and follow Me on to Calvary, and thence on to eternal glory as My holy martyr has done." May the Lord our God who has allowed us to offer the Divine Sacrifice in honour of His servant, grant us one day to taste of joys supernatural, and like him to be in glory and honour; and crowned with a crown of the precious stone like to the one St. Wenceslaus wears. This is the burthen of the Post-Communion.

THE COMMON OF HOLY WOMEN: MASS "COGNOVI."  
(St. Bridget, Widow, October 8th.)

"Let us praise our God in the confession of Blessed Bridget," and pray Him, the Benign, through her prayers, to forgive the pains due to our sins; so with pure hearts may we sing to Him a grateful song of thanksgiving for the favours He has given to this His servant (cf. *Hymn. ad Mat.*). And in this Eucharistic Sacrifice we pray the Sacred Victim, Who is the King, and the strength of "valiant women," and

While alone doing great things, to hear in His goodness the supplications we are about to offer (cf. *Hymn. ad Lauds*).

The Introit (Ps. cxviii.) is from the wonderful psalm which runs through our Little Hours, and which is deservedly called the "Psalm of the Saints," or the "Song of the Law;" for it treats of the secret of the saints which is love fulfilling the law (cf. Rom. xiii. 10). "I know, O Lord, that Thy judgments are righteousness, and *that* in Thy truth hast Thou humbled me. Pierce with Thy fear my flesh; I am afraid of Thy judgments. Blessed are the undefiled in the way, they who walk in the law of the Lord." As is used, the Introit gives the key to the saint's life. Her history shows that she knew that in this life all things are, as St. Ambrose says, ordered by the judgments of a righteous God—that all troubles, sicknesses, vexations, are sent to us as so many means which He, in His infinite love, gives us to cleanse our souls from their dross, and leave only the pure gold, which the Divine Workman may fashion to honour (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 20). It is His truth that humbles us, for it gives us the real knowledge of what we are, and of what He is. St. Bridget, early bereft as she was of a tender mother's care, was soon attracted by grace to the service of Christ; and after a vision of His Sacred Passion, the remembrance of that terrible judgment upon sin, so pierced her flesh with holy fear, and humbled her, that she knew that all the ills of life which might fall to her lot were only the righteous deserts of her sin. In the spirit of holy fear and penance she was led to punish her body with all manner of mortifications, and to weary it out with works of charity to her neighbours. As well-ordered charity begins at home, she, after she was married, laboured by example and precept to draw her husband on to the higher life of the Counsels, and brought up her children in the deepest and truest piety. The poor and the sick were her special care; and with her own royal hands did she tend them in the hospital her munificence had provided. It was that fear of the Lord, and her true knowledge of self, that set her feet "in the way of wisdom," and made her take heed lest she came under His judgment as a slothful servant. Thus



schooling herself, she was ready, when the time came, to give herself up with her husband entirely to God, and enter upon the perfect "way." Therein she indeed did walk undefiled. What is this "way" but the footsteps of Him Who says, "I am the Way" (John xiv. 6)? She walked in this way in white raiment, because she was worthy (Apoc. iii. 4); therefore is her name not blotted out of the Book of Life (cf. *loc. cit.*), and she is held blessed for ever.

The beautiful Collect is proper to the feast, and refers to the revelations made to the saint. Holy Church reminds her God that He has been pleased to reveal, through His only Son, heavenly "secrets such as it is not given to man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 4) to holy Bridget; therefore does she pray that we too, who are His servants, may one day rejoice and be made glad when the veil is withdrawn, and the secrets of eternal glory are made known.

In the Epistle (1 Tim. v.) we get the perfect picture of our saint as she grew "in the way" after her husband's death. She was a "widow, indeed," and therefore is she to be held in honour. She ruled well her own household, and brought up her children in the knowledge and love of God; and thus made she a return to them of the care and holy training she had received from her parents. She made herself "desolate" of family ties for Christ's sake, and leaving her royal home she became a wanderer on the face of the earth. She founded a convent where holy ones might join her "in continuous supplication and prayer, day and night;" and knowing full well "that she who liveth in pleasure is dead" in God's eyes, set out boldly along the thorny path of mortification. Her good works were a testimony to her holiness. She had indeed as St. Paul says, educated, in the truest sense of the word, her children, exercised much hospitality to those in want; and, as we read in the 5th Lesson, washed and kissed the feet of God's poor: ministered to the afflicted, and diligently followed every good work. So was she "a widow, indeed," according to the apostolic pattern.

The Gradual is from one of our matin psalms (xliv.)—

that one in which is celebrated the beauty of the "Wife of the Lamb" (Apoc. xxi. 9). "Grace is poured forth into thy lips: therefore hath God blessed thee for ever. Because of *thy* truth and meekness and justice: and thy right hand shall wonderfully lead thee. Alleluia, alleluia." In thy beauty and comeliness set out, go on prosperously, and reign. Alleluia!" The winning power of grace was poured forth upon St. Bridget's lips, and her burning words were efficacious, not only with her husband, but in Rome, where she had gone by God's commands. There she stirred up all who heard her, and made their hearts burn within them (cf. Luke xxiv. 32); and God made her conquests of souls so many blessings to her for ever. Truth made her know that God's judgments are righteousness; meekness made her possess her soul in peace; while justice caused her to spend and be spent in the service of her neighbour. What was her "right hand" which did so wonderfully lead her? It is surely the "right hand" of her Divine Spouse which embraced her (Cant. ii. 6), and which held her up (cf. Ps. xvii. 35); and as this "right hand" was ever ready for her at any time, and was her constant support, it is fittingly called hers. And how wonderfully it did lead her on

"O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till  
The night is done,"

and the journey is safely over: and now, at last, she has reached home, and reigns in God's kingdom, adorned with heavenly beauty and comeliness!

The Gospel (St. Matthew xiii.) gives us, as it were, a triptych of two golden pictures, one of St. Bridget's search after God; and the other of God's search after her. God, says the Divine Master, is like a hidden pearl of great price, which St. Bridget, after much toil, found; and so enamoured of His beauty did she become, that she counted nothing of any value compared with His possession. So she gave up all to go. Him. On the other hand, God saw in the field of this world St. Bridget as a gem of much value, hidden in the most unlikely spot, a royal court; and the beauty and comeliness of her soul won His heart, and He determined to

make her His spouse. He loved her, and gave Himself up for her (cf. St. John iii. 16), and with joy poured out all the treasures of His precious blood in order to purchase her soul; and with His right hand did He lead her into His garden, where, beneath His shadow, she sits her down with great delight (cf. Cant. ii 3). Again, St. Bridget cast her net into the sea of life, and with wise discrimination she “saw the good and approved it,” and rejected that which was bad. God, in His nets, made from those “cords of Adam” (Osce xi. 4), by which He draws us, caught the soul of the saint, and puts her into the “vessel of election,” His own most sacred Heart. Then again, like the prudent householder, did St. Bridget bring forth for her spouse things old and new: the old treasures of her merits, and the ever new treasures of her burning love; for at her “gates are all manner of pleasant fruits, new and old” (Cant. vii.) which she has laid up for her beloved; and He, “the beauty ever ancient, ever new,” as St. Augustine calls Him, gave her the old wine of His tender mercies in this life; and when she had well drunk thereof, then her ecstasy to find that He had kept the new, the choicest wine “until now,” the eternal day (cf. St. John ii. 10), even that new wine which He drinks with His elect in the kingdom of heaven (cf. St. Matthew xxvi. 29).

The Offertory carries on this last thought of the blessedness of our saint in heaven, and gives a new meaning to the words we used in the Gradual. The blessing is hers for everlasting ages! The grace poured forth on her lips, “which are like lillies, dropping sweet-smelling myrrh” (Cant. v. 13), was not only that which touched the hearts of others, but was also the gift of prophecy and the knowledge of the hidden things of heaven. It is now a fitting time for us to think of this grace, for we are going within the veil, and are going to touch and handle the mysteries of God; for, if we use well the grace that will come from our lips when we utter the words of consecration, our sanctification will be assured, and we too shall be blessed for ever. That this may be so is what Holy Church, in the secret prayer, asks through the intercession of St. Bridget.

In the Communion, which is from the same psalm, the thought of the love of justice and hatred of sin, which filled St. Bridget's heart, and made her God anoint her with His Holy Unction above her fellows, reminds us now that we have within us that same Eternal Justice and Holiness Whom the saint loved so well, and from Whom she got so great a reward. Have we not then got the same means, or rather far more efficacious means in our priesthood of loving justice and hating sin? As a proof thereof, and as a pledge to us that we can attain all holiness, God, *our* God, has even now anointed us with His holy oil of ordination, and set us above our fellows, among "the princes of His people" (Ps. cxii. 8). Would that we answered to "the grace which is poured" into us with such abundance, and *be* above our fellows in holiness and spotliness whilst "in the way!" May God, by our saint's prayers, grant us this, is the prayer of the Post-Communion.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## THE LAYMAN'S PRAYER-BOOK IN THE MIDDLE AGES.<sup>1</sup>

MR. LITTLEHALES has proved himself better than his word. Having held out to his readers the hope of offering students in our branch of liturgiology, in the course of a few years' time, a second instalment of his laborious work, he has issued another part of his *Prymer* not many months after the publication of the opening portion. The first volume of his painstaking and valuable work "supplied the full text of a *prymer* in English." The second, or present volume, "contains a collation of the manuscripts; shows the variations of each with the others; and furnishes

<sup>1</sup> *The Prymer, or Prayer-book, of the Lay People, in the Middle Ages, in English*, dating about 1490 A.D. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Henry Littlehales. Part II.: Collation of MSS. London and New York: Longmans. 1892.



means to obtain a correct text" of prymer in the vernacular. Whilst the third and last part "will deal with the history of the Prymer itself; its relation to the service-books proper; and the use of the book both in church and at home." Meanwhile, the author continues, "I have attempted to supply a sketch of the Prymer, which may be of service, and increase our familiarity with the common prayer-book of our forefathers." This purpose has been effected in the two books that are, or have been, before us (the first of which was noticed in the pages of the *I. E. RECORD*, upon its issue from the press), has been effected, it may be added, in a workmanlike and satisfactory manner. The labour of collating so many manuscripts as Mr. Littlehales here deals with, both in relation to each other and in regard to what the author considers to be a typical prymer, though there exists no authoritative text to be followed, must have been excessive; and the care taken to reproduce such a series of collations without error can only be estimated by those who have had, at the least, some experience in such matters. The obvious, tangible result bears no proportion to the actual work done: and the steps by which the result is gained are invisible to, and can only be imagined by the general reader. When, however, it is remembered that the Primer texts are thirteen in number; are contained in seven different libraries, situate in four different cities, as far divided from each other as London from Glasgow, and as Cambridge from Oxford, the average student may estimate some of the primary difficulties attendant upon Mr. Littlehale's self-imposed task in his labour of love. If, beyond this, it be stated, as an evidence of the care with which the book has been printed, a fact which even the student cannot know without being told; viz., that of some of the proofs of the book, seven, and perhaps more impressions were taken after as many revisions, the amount of time lavishly devoted to the reproduction of his work may be conceived, if not realized. That the results accord with the toil undergone, must be taken for granted—at least by the present writer, who is powerless to follow the editor from city to city, and from one public library to another, and whose education in deciphering, not

to speak of the strain upon eyesight demanded by reading sixteenth-century hieroglyphics, unfortunately has been neglected. In any case, the results attained have been presented to the reader in a sumptuous literary form of type, ink, and paper, and with an exhaustiveness of detail which is beyond praise, though it should not be beyond the expression of gratitude on the part of the appreciative and sympathetic student of Early English *prymers*.

In this volume Mr. Littlehales confines his attention to two points. First, he is concerned with early manuscript prayer-books alone: with those of a later date, produced subsequently to the introduction of printing, he is unconcerned. Secondly, he devotes himself to *prymers* in the English language only. To a manuscript, which is probably of equal, or of greater, textual value with those collated, the editor gives a reference, indeed, and a laconic notice, but no examination, on the ground that it is written in a duplex form, in both Latin and English, and he is restricted in plan to books in the latter language. The manuscripts that are here dealt with, whether by comparison or by contrast, are arranged by Mr. Littlehales with perhaps almost a hypercritical and needless division of labour—seeing that practically the book essentially is one and the same, to whatever extent one division may be, accidentally, sundered from another—according to their contents, into two classes. One of these classes consists of three members which are of a more extended form in their contents, and the first of them was re-printed half a century ago by that distinguished liturgiologist, the late Mr. Maskell. The residue consist of ten members, and this division embraces all the manuscripts which are compiled in a shorter form. There would appear, however, to be other two classes of English manuscript *prymers*, named incidentally, but not described categorically by Mr. Littlehales, which are, probably, deserving of more scientific classification. One of these classes may include—for with limited knowledge it were wiser to speak hypothetically—all *prymers* which are enriched with musical notation; and the other class may contain *prymers* of the bi-lingual character, written both in the sacred tongue and

in the vernacular. Of existing and known manuscripts but a single example of the latter form can now be quoted by one who possesses such wide knowledge of, and has used such persevering research after prymer as Mr. Littlehales; and he is acquainted with but few copies in manuscript of prymer that are musically annotated. If severe criticism be offended at the suggestion of the above-named fresh classification of prymer on the score of the paucity of examples in each class, it must not be forgotten that whilst these deal only with single or duplicate copies, Mr. Littlehales himself would raise to the dignity of a class a form of manuscript which can only claim three extant copies. On one aspect of the matter, the author writes as follows in his introduction:—

“In the year 1500, a certain parish church possessed ‘A Prymier notyd off the gift off Sir Clement Smythe, another Prymier notyd.’ Inventory of church goods, Cowper’s ‘Accounts of the churchwardens of St Dunstan’s, Canterbury.’ The above is remarkable for two reasons; one, that it is, perhaps, the only reference to a prymer having musical notation; the other, the fact of two prymer forming part of the property of a parish church. The manuscript prymer in English now remaining do not contain any musical notation; nor, so far as I am aware, is such an addition to be found in any printed copy, however late the date. That the Latin version contained such an addition, is certain, for copies yet remain; and the fact may possibly be another indication of the use of the Latin version amongst the higher classes. The fact of the book forming part of the goods of a church, appears peculiarly strange, for the prymer was intended probably for the use of the laity exclusively, and, strictly speaking, cannot be considered as a service-book. I have failed to discover the meaning of these two books appearing in the inventory, and for whom and for what purpose they were in the hands of the churchwardens; but I would venture to suggest that they were possibly awaiting a purchaser. We know that the mediæval churchwarden did receive articles by gift which could not by any possibility be turned to account in the public services; and we know, too, that these articles were sold and the money was expended in the support of the church. Against such an explanation there is certainly the fact that in the long list whence the above extract is derived these prymer form the sole items which cannot be directly connected with the services.”

<sup>1</sup> *The Prymer*, pp. xii. and xiii.

The second part of Mr. Littlehales' Prymer deals with all the known existing primers in the English language. These are thirteen in number, and to them one more must be added, the collating of which has been ignored in the present volume on the sufficient ground that it is "written in two languages, Latin and English." The collated manuscripts now find a home in the following libraries:—Three are preserved in the British Museum; five have gravitated to the Bodkian at Oxford; Queen's College, Oxford, can boast of having one copy; Cambridge owns three copies, one belonging to the University and two to as many college libraries; and the last of the English manuscript primers may be consulted from the shelves of the Hunterian Library, in the Presbyterian city of Glasgow—the same library which also possesses the Anglo-Latin copy spoken of above, which falls beyond the scope of Mr. Littlehales' plan. These manuscripts vary in date to the extent, in round numbers, of one hundred years. They were probably written between A.D. 1378 and a date unknown definitely, but certainly subsequently to the year 1460.

It is noteworthy that not fewer than four of the manuscripts record in their calendars the event of the crowning of Richard II., in 1377; and two of them mention the great earthquake which occurred in England in the year 1382. Eleven of these thirteen volumes were known to the late Mr. Maskell; and one of them was printed, with an introduction and notes, in that author's *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. The size of the various manuscripts differs considerably from each other. The smallest reaches the dimensions of five by four inches; others are described as being written on large octavo leaves, quarto, and small folio. Only two of the copies appear to have retained their old binding, with its original sides of oak, and covered with stamped brown leather. A few of the manuscripts are imperfect, to the extent of ending suddenly at an inopportune leaf, or of having lost their final pages, or, in one case, of having suffered from the removal of an integral portion of its contents. The longest manuscript known at present reaches to leaf 179 in the folio copy; and the shortest ends,



in a quarto size, at the sixty-first leaf. Of the penmanship itself, and of the existing material condition of these manuscripts, Mr. Littlehales reports but scanty particulars. The writing of one of the manuscripts, dated 1430, approaches in character that of the cursive style; but the usual manuscript lettering is of the ordinary kind at the date in question. The old tomes seem to have been preserved to nigh upon the close of the nineteenth century with little outward injury; whilst within the boards, of leather or of wood, the colours of the inks of at least one of them, which the editor describes, have retained their vivid black and red during the period of at least five and a-half hundred years.

These accidental circumstances attendant on Mr. Littlehales' collection of manuscripts being dismissed, a few notes may be made on the contents of his liturgical treasures. As a rule, without an exception (the apparent exception having been already explained), the contents of the English manuscript primers are divisible into two clearly-defined portions—the invariable and the changeful. The invariable portion is sixfold, and includes—1, the Hours of our Blessed Lady; 2, the Seven Penitential Psalms; 3, the Fifteen Gradual Psalms; 4, the Litany of the Saints; 5, the Office for the Holy Dead; 6, the Commendation of the Soul at the Hour of Death. These six divisions were usually prefaced by the Calendar, and occasionally by the Table for finding the date of Easter; whilst frequently were added, by way of complement, the common forms of the Christian religion—the Lord's Prayer, the *Ave*, the *Credo*, the *Confiteor*, and the Commandments. The details of the latter additions to the normal contents of the volume varied considerably in character, and included, amongst other elements, some of which are sometimes unique, these—Items of religious instruction, passages for devotion and meditation, extracts from the works of saints and fathers, verses from Holy Scripture, the last Seven Words of Christ, a Christian man's confession, explanation on the Commandments, on the five bodily "wits," on the seven bodily and "ghostly" acts of mercy, on the seven

Gifts of the Holy Ghost, on the seven deadly sins, and, occasionally, on the "sixteen properties of charity." On looking over these indices of contents of the layman's book of devotion five centuries ago, and in marking the unity with variation which they display with regard to similar works of piety in our own day, we cannot fail to be struck with the evidence, even in so small a matter of secondary importance, of the changelessness in the ways and means of the Catholic Church of God.

The introductory portion of Mr. Littlehales' Prymer consists of a series of notes, more or less brief, which treat of many points of interest to the liturgical student, and which are suggestive of many more, some of which, to be quite frank, might have been pursued somewhat further with advantage to the reader. The latter, however, may easily be instructed by the author on various details of his subject; and on certain questions little more can be said than has been said. Some of the topics considered and discussed may be named to show the wide range of inquiry explored by Mr. Littlehales:—Why the Prymer in English may claim to be *the* mediæval prayer-book; why so few copies of the Prymer remain; its appearance and contents, and cost (sometimes "two shillings") and use; its mode of employment in life; the fact of its being mentioned as a legacy in wills, and its treatment after death; and the mere liturgical question of the various uses of the book which probably existed. Of these subjects, the question why so few mediæval prayer-books have descended to the present day may be shortly answered from the "Statutes at large," quoted by Mr. Littlehales, and from even a slight knowledge of the story of the Reformation in England: viz., "That all books called . . . prymer, in Latin or English . . . shall be, by authority of this present Act [1549] clearly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden for ever to be used or kept." And that such laws were carried out, we may learn continues the author from the following:—"Articles of accusation against Morrall [an old Catholic name of the present day], Catline, and Sharpe, for hearing of Mass and keeping Popish books" (*Calendar of State Papers, 1547-80*).

On the question of mediæval prayer-books, Mr. Littlehales has himself summarized his arguments in a form which makes them easy of quotation, from elsewhere, in the following terms :—

“It is generally considered that of the prayer-books of the Middle Ages two only can lay claim to have had any really considerable circulation—one, the *Horæ*, or Hours of the Blessed Virgin, in Latin (with other matter); the other, the *Prymer*, or Hours of the Blessed Virgin, in English (with other matter). To me the *Prymer* appears to have been by far the more popular book, and for the reasons given below.

“1. The *Prymer* was in English. Father Bridgett, C.S.S.R., has kindly pointed out to me that (Blessed) Sir Thomas More, in his *Works* (page 850), appears to take it as a fact that about half the people could read English. We can hardly suppose that as many could then read Latin. This fact alone must carry great weight in determining the circulation of the two books at that period.

“2. The *Prymer* was a less expensive book to buy, containing, so far as may be judged from existing copies, little ornamentation of any kind, and apparently in no case a single miniature; whereas the *Horæ* was frequently, perhaps generally, rich with illuminations and miniatures. The *Horæ* is, indeed, often a volume of extreme beauty and richness; the *Prymer* almost always a book conspicuously plain and inexpensive.

“3. Much of the *Horæ*, the exact words, may be found in the *Breviary* and *Manual*. In no case will a line of the *Prymer* be found in any service-book.

“4. A *prymer* will be found to contain a specific series of offices, all following each other, without intervening devotions. It is not so with the *Horæ*, for in many cases a particular office will either not appear at all, or be preceded or followed by something totally unexpected. The invariable sequence of offices is, so far as I am aware, to be found in the *Prymer* alone, neither the *Horæ* nor any other mediæval book of devotion being able to lay claim to such an important distinction.

“5. The fact of copies of the *Prymer* being far less numerous now than those of the *Horæ* may be accounted for in this way: the *Horæ*, more expensive, and in Latin, we may very reasonably believe to have been, generally speaking, the property of the higher classes, who would have ample opportunity to secrete their prayer-book, however actively the law for its destruction might be prosecuted; while, in the case of the more humble owner of the *Prymer*, the opportunity for evading the same law must of necessity have been far more restricted.

“Again, in the house of a rich man, a *Horæ* might be for

years unobserved; while in an ordinary home a Prymer could hardly be unheeded for long, and, consequently, would run far greater risks of destruction, even if only from carelessness or lack of interest."

Without pretending, but rather the contrary, to possess the knowledge acquired after much research by Mr. Littlehales, the writer ventures to think that, perhaps, the last word has not been said on the relative employment of the two popular books of devotion, the *Hours* and the *Prymer*. It is at least probable that the proportion of those who reading at all, in mediæval times, could read Latin, was very far larger than the proportion which obtains at the present day. In any case, it is noteworthy to how large an extent post-Reformation *prymers* were printed for a long succession of years, in a bi-lingual form, and were illustrated with wood-cuts and copper-plates, almost, if not quite, down to the last century: whilst the reproduction of the Catholic *Hours*, apparently and comparatively ceased. But this is a question beyond the range of the present paper, and need not be continued.

The question of the various uses of the *Prymer*, Mr. Littlehales frankly and modestly postpones to a future date, in his Third Part, when he shall be more prepared, by wider research, to offer an opinion on this difficult subject. Meanwhile, he thinks that the use of York alone may be safely predicated of any manuscript *prymer*, from the prominence given to saints in the northern province in the calendar of the book, and by an "allusion to the Archbishop in the Litany." A curious fact is brought to light, perhaps for the first time, in this book—that the *Prymer* sometimes contained a series of "Graces," before or after taking food, suitable for use at particular seasons of the Christian year. Mr. Littlehales has not availed himself of his opportunity to annotate very widely the names of the holy ones invoked in the mediæval Litany of the Saints through the medium of the *Prymer*. A comparison of a fourteenth or fifteenth century *prymer* with the Missal of the present day would show some curious vacillations in popular veneration of individual saints—in additions, omissions, variations, and



substitutions—together with the fact of a single erasure (however this may be accounted for) of the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury, in a prymer in the Bodleian Library, of the approximate date of 1378. Amongst others, these saints' popularity would seem to have somewhat waned in England—to adopt the author's spelling—St. Maury, St. Ipolyte, St. Victor, St. Albon, St. Eustas, St. Huwe, St. Gernyn, St. Pernele, St. Christea, St. Olyne, St. Edith, St. ffelicite, SS. ffetithe, Hoope, and Charite, and to name but one more, St. ffresewythe. Some of these names are, at first sight, hardly recognisable by the average reader; and two or three fail to reveal themselves (at least to the writer) after repeated thought—such as St. Pernele, or St. Patronilla. Of St. Albon it may be permitted to say, that had the editor read St. Alban, his manuscript would probably have justified the printing of a good typographical *a* in the place of a bad *o* in manuscript. Oxford persons of to-day may, with difficulty, recognise, under the form of the last-mentioned name on the above list, their local saint and patroness to which once they were so much devoted, the Virgin St. Frideswide. Mr. Littlehales' concluding sentences may fairly be quoted as the final words of this examination of his work. They appear to be not less true than noteworthy, as coming from the pen of an Anglican layman who has almost singularly and withal piously devoted himself to this section of Catholic liturgiology; and we can gladly make his sentiments our own:—

“ In conclusion, I would add that the Prymer forms a valuable link in the chain of evidence respecting the religious knowledge and piety of our mediæval forefathers. At times, we meet with statements disputing both the one and the other. Such statements, however, rarely give references to existing contemporary documents, and in dealing with such a question evidence of the period alone can be relied upon. The witnesses of the piety of our ancestors may be found in the generous offerings of all classes recorded to churchwardens' accounts, the unstinted labour expended on church fabrics, with the material and workmanship of their furniture, the simple epitaphs, the ample endowments, the frequent attendance at churches never artificially warmed, the religious feeling evinced in private family letters, and the solemn and beautiful language of ancient wills. From such evidence,

with enough more of a similar character, we may obtain a trustworthy estimate of the piety of our pre-Reformation forefathers. Corresponding evidence of the period of the Reformation and succeeding years we do not find so readily to hand; indeed, the absence of such evidence is conspicuous."

Within the last few weeks Mr. Littlehales has contributed to the columns of the *Tablet* newspaper an occasional note, which may well be added to the above, upon the subject on which he is so deeply interested. It contains the opinion of another expert in liturgiology, and forms part of a footnote on page 55 in a book entitled, *Early Collections of Canons known as Hibernensis*, by the late Henry Bradshaw, sometime librarian to the University Library, Cambridge. The passage runs thus:—

" . . . It is known that the Layman's Prayer-book (the *Primarium* or *Primer*, as it was called in England), consists, in its earliest form, of the Psalter and Litany, to which the Vigils of the Dead are commonly added. By the end of the thirteenth century we find it consisting not of the whole Psalter, but of the Seven Penitential Psalms only, with the Litany and the Vigils of the Dead, and having prefixed to it what are known as the Hours of the Blessed Virgin (*Hora Beatae Mariae Virginis*). These Hours seem to me to have originated in a special commemorative service to be used during Advent in connection with devotion to the Incarnation; just as still later we find the Hours of the Passion (*Horae de Sancta Cruce*) and the Hours of the Holy Ghost (*Horae de Sancto Spiritu*) drawn up, apparently, as special commemorative services for use at Passiontide and Whitsuntide. As time went on, the constant public use of the full daily hour-service in church, at which all were expected to attend, fell off; while the clergy, being bound, in any case, to say their hours, were allowed to repeat them privately. The laity were relieved from the use of the full hour-service of the Breviary, and these shorter commemorative services were then made of general application, instead of being supplementary devotions to be used merely during the season of the year to which they were especially appropriate. They thus came to be more constantly found in the Layman's Prayer Book. With the growth of the devotion to the Mother of our Lord, the *Advent* Hours of the Incarnation took the form, or rather the name, of Hours of the Blessed Virgin used constantly throughout the year; and they thenceforward became the leading or principal element in these Layman's Prayer-books, and eventually, in later times, gathered round them a mass of miscellaneous devotions, which varied to an

almost unlimited extent in different localities. Such are the conclusions which a careful study of the books themselves has led me to adopt. . . ."

It is rash for a tyro to question the opinion of an expert in his own line; but, it may be permitted to ask Mr. Littlehales to examine the statement above made in the preface to his Third Part, viz., what may be the evidence for saying (with Mr. Bradshaw) that "the constant public use (by laymen) of the full daily hour service in church, *at which all were bound to attend*, fell off?" The prominence given to the Advent offices in the Prymer is a noteworthy fact; and the development, if so it be, of the theoretic use of the office of our Lady all the year round, demands explanation. But the obligation of recitation by the laity will be a new idea to many persons: and it is difficult to see how the temporal side of life could be conveniently carried on, or what great devotional difference would exist between the layman and the religious, if the latter as well as the former were expected alike to assist in public in the parish or conventual church, eight or nine times in the day. For it cannot be supposed that any secondary obligation to recite the Hours on the part of the laity would lessen their primary privilege to be present also at the daily Offering of Holy Mass.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

P.S.—It will be an act of courtesy if any liturgiologist, under whose eye this paper may fall, will communicate with Mr. Littlehales, at his address, Clovelly, Bexley Heath, Kent, should he be in a position to furnish "additional references to the mediæval prayer-book from pre-Reformation sources," or to offer results of independent study on questions connected with his work.

## Liturgical Questions.

---

### "THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS."

"REV. DEAR SIR, — In reading through Father O'Loan's book, entitled, *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, I find that he differs, in many rather important points, from the plain and by no means obscure directions of the rubrics, and also from the opinions of the highest authorities on the rubrics: viz., Martinucci and Wapelhorst.

"In speaking of the duties of deacon and subdeacon, in the fifth chapter, page 36, he says that the deacon and subdeacon should genuflect on the predella when they go up with the celebrant for the incensing, before the Introit. In this case the rubric makes no mention of a genuflection to be made by the deacon or subdeacon, but simply directs them to go up with the celebrant. The words of the rubric are: — 'In missa solemnī sacerdos facta confessione, ascendit cum ministris ad medium altaris: ubi dicto *oramus te Domine*, et osculato altari ponit incensum in thuribulum ministrante diacono naviculum, et thuriferario thuribulum.' Now, whenever the celebrant or sacred ministers are to genuflect or perform any other action, the rubrics of the Missal prescribe it: e.g., in tit. ix. 7 the rubric directs the deacon and subdeacon to genuflect when passing the cross: in tit. ix. 4 the deacon is instructed to genuflect before leaving the Gospel side, at the words 'Per hæc omnia;' in tit. x. 8 the deacon and subdeacon are directed to genuflect at the words 'Et dimitte nobis debita nostra,' in the *Pater Noster*. I could quote many other instances throughout the Missal on Solemn Mass where the deacon and subdeacon are told to genuflect. Wherefore, as the rubrics make no mention of a genuflection to be made by the deacon or subdeacon when they go up with the celebrant at the Introit, I fail to see why it should be made. Wapelhorst, no mean authority, in his compendium, *Sacrae Liturgiae*, page 136, says: 'Diaconus ascendit, fimbriam anteriorem vestium celebrantis paululum sublevaris: cum genuflectit et suppeditatio.' He gives the same instructions to the subdeacon on page 137.

"Father O'Loan falls into the same error when speaking of the genuflection to be made at the commencement of the *Gloria* and *Credo*. Father O'Loan directs that the deacon and



subdeacon should genuflect, behind the celebrant, at the word 'Deo' in the *Gloria*, and at 'Deum' in the *Credo*, before going up to recite the *Gloria* and the *Credo* with the celebrant. Martinucci, speaking of the duties of the deacon in Solemn Mass (lib. i., c. xiii., n. 28), says: 'Ad intonationem "*Gloria in excelsis*" *inclinabit caput ad verbum "Deo"* et *SINE genuflectione* conscendit suppadaneum;' and Wapellhorst, page 136, says: 'Diaconus inclinabit, et simul cum subdiacono ascendit ad dextram celebrantis et recitet hymnum voce non alta.'

"These two very able writers and commentators on the rubrics expressly state that there is no genuflection made by the deacon or subdeacon before they go up to recite the *Gloria* or *Credo*, but simply an inclination of the head. The words of Martinucci, when speaking of the duties of the deacon at the *Credo*, are stronger and clearer. He says: 'Ad intonationem symboli diaconus caput inclinabit ad verbum Deum et sine ulla alia genuflectione ad dextram celebrantis ascendit in suppedaneum.'<sup>1</sup> In speaking of these genuflections to be made by the deacon and subdeacon before the Introit, and after the words 'Deo' in the *Gloria* and 'Deum' in the *Credo*, Father O'Loan does not appear to me to be at all consistent. He would have the deacon and the subdeacon genuflect on the predella at the incensing before the Introit, and at the words 'Deo' and 'Deum' in the *Gloria* and *Credo*, he would have them genuflect behind the celebrant. Why not direct them go up and genuflect on the predella, if they are to genuflect at all, as at the Introit? 'Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.' By what authority, I would like to know, does Father O'Loan direct the deacon, after having recited the *Sanctus*, to genuflect before leaving the celebrant's right, and repeat the genuflection when he has arrived at the celebrant's left? The deacon should not genuflect either at the right or left of the celebrant at any time before the consecration. Therefore, having said the *Sanctus*, he passes to the left of the celebrant, having genuflected in the middle when passing. Martinucci<sup>2</sup> is very plain when speaking of how the deacon should act in this particular place: "Et trisagio recitato, *SINE GENUFLECTIONE* se (Diaconus) convertet super dexteram suam, de suppedaneo descendet, genuflectionem faciet in medio gradu superiore, et ad sinistram transibit celebrantis.' And Wapellhorst is no less clear. He says:

Lib. i., n. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i., n. 75.

· Diaconus ascenlit ad librum genuflectet IN MEDIO vertet folia.'

From these quotations it will appear that Father O'Loan, in his work entitled *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, has put forward opinions which, without a few words of explanation, would appear to be directly opposite to the rubrics, and the teaching of some of the best authorities on the rubrics. I presume you will have no objection to give, in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD, a few words of explanation on these few points which I now bring under your notice. I am quite sure that such an explanation will be of much interest to many readers of the I. E. RECORD.

"D. J. H."

"D. J. H." makes three distinct charges against the author of *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*: 1. That he has given directions which are directly opposed to the rubrics of the Missal. 2. That he differs on many important points from "some of the best authorities on the rubrics." 3. That even in his mistakes he is not consistent with himself. These are serious charges, no doubt: but, as even "D. J. H." expresses a hope that "a few words of explanation" will serve to dispel them, it may be that there is no foundation at all for them. Let us examine them one by one.

I. The first charge, namely, that certain directions in the book referred to are opposed to the rubrics, is established by our correspondent in this manner:—"This book directs the deacon and subdeacon to genuflect when they go up to the predella after the *Confiteor*. But the rubrics say nothing about this genuflection. Therefore these directions are opposed to the rubrics." Were the minor of this syllogism, "But the rubrics say they are not to genuflect on this occasion," the *vis consequentiæ* would be, at least, more apparent. "But," continues our correspondent, "the rubrics prescribe when and where the sacred ministers are to genuflect during the Mass; consequently the very silence of the rubrics amounts to a positive prohibition." We deny this consequence, and will ask our correspondent to carefully compare his two favourite authors with the rubrics, and see even if they do not bear us out. The fact is that this general

question about the silence of the rubrics is one that is, and has long been, in dispute; and the author of the book in question would seem to have adopted the opinion opposite to that held by our correspondent. Hence it would be more accurate in our correspondent to say that the directions to which he takes exception are opposed to his interpretation of the rubrics, than to say that these directions are opposed to the rubrics themselves.

2. Martinucci and Wapelhorst are "some of the best authorities on the rubrics," to whom the author of *The Ceremonies, &c.*, has not paid the compliment of adopting their opinion. Perhaps, if our correspondent had consulted all the authorities on the rubrics which were consulted by the author of this work on every single disputed point, he would not be so slavish an admirer of the two he mentions. The question of the sacred ministers genuflecting on the predella, when they ascend the altar after the *Confiteor*, and of their genuflecting before going up to recite the *Gloria* and *Credo*, is likewise a disputed question; but the overwhelming weight of authority is in favour of making the genuflection. Hence the author of *The Ceremonies, &c.*, whose desire it was to follow, on disputed points, the best-supported opinion, directed the sacred ministers to genuflect on these occasions. As we are writing this at a distance from our books, we cannot give direct quotations to show that the weight of authority is in favour of making the genuflection; but we happen to have at hand two books which will enable us to do this indirectly. The books are the *Cérémonial Romain*, by Falise; and the *Cérémonial selon le rit Romain*, by Vavasseur. Both authors direct these genuflections; and Falise, as is his wont, cites his authority in the text within brackets. For these genuflections his authority is thus cited—(A. A.). And here is his own explanation of the abbreviation:—

"Quant aux citations d'auteurs, observons que le double lettre (A. A.) indique le sentiment commun, ou à peu près unanime des rubricistes, quand il ne l'est pas tout à fait. . . Ailleurs, et quand il y a divergence chez l'un ou l'autre, ils sont repris par leurs initiales respectives."

According to Falise, therefore, the directions for which the author of *The Ceremonies*, &c., is so roundly condemned, is the common, or all but unanimous, teaching of rabbinists. Vavasseur says the same; for he cites, as his authority for directing the sacred ministers to make these genuflections, *La plupart des auteurs*. Perhaps our correspondent will now admit that it is Martinucci and Wapelhorst themselves who are singular.

Our correspondent further asks: "By what authority, I would like to know, does Father O'Loan direct the deacon, after having recited the *Sanctus*, to genuflect before leaving the celebrant's right, and repeat the genuflection when he has arrived at the celebrant's left?" There is no want of authority for this: but, for the reason already mentioned, we can give them, for the most part, only at second hand. Falise, speaking of the deacon's duties after the *Sanctus*, says:—

"S'il est à droite il fait la genuflection à sa place, et vient au livre, où il récite la genuflection."

And for this direction Falise recites the following names:—Merati, Janssens, Byssus, Cavalieri, a Porto, Lohmer. To these we can add, even from our present limited stock of books, Vavasseur and De Herdt. The latter, speaking of the deacon, after the *Sanctus*, says:—

"Ad *Benedictus* se erigit et se signat; deinde *facta reverentia*, a dextra celebrantis transit ad eam sinistram ubi *decan* facit *reverentiam*."

We hope our correspondent is now satisfied that there is some little authority for deserting his pet authors.

3. The third charge made is a charge of inconsistency, even in errors. And the foundation for this charge is, that, whereas the sacred ministers are directed to genuflect on the predella when they first ascend the altar, they are directed to genuflect behind the celebrant before going up to recite with him the *Gloria* and the *Credo*. This charge would seem to have been made by our correspondent without reflection. If there be an inconsistency, which there is not, as anyone



may see, our correspondent has the merit of being the first one, and, so far, the only one, to discover it.

If our correspondent has anything more to say on this subject, he will kindly give his name for publication, as it cannot be expected that notice will in future be taken of communications like his unless the writer gives his name.

#### INDULGENCED CRUCIFIXES.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—In your answer to inquirer’s question regarding crucifixes indulgenced for the *Via Crucis*, you speak only of crucifixes blessed by a *Priest* having the necessary faculties. You say, ‘(c) The crucifix must be blessed by a priest having the necessary faculties.’

“But what of crucifixes indulgenced for the *Via Crucis* by the Pope, or by Cardinal Melchero in virtue of a privilege conferred on him alone by Pius IX., and confirmed by Leo XIII.? Cannot those who possess crucifixes thus blessed gain the indulgences of the *Via Crucis* whenever they wish—at any time even when they can conveniently visit the stations canonically erected in the church. In other words, is it not right to say that condition ‘(a) It must be difficult, if not morally impossible, for him to perform the devotion of the Way of the Cross in the ordinary manner,’ &c., does not apply?

“A. B.”

In detailing the conditions for gaining the indulgence of the *Via Crucis* by the use of an indulgenced crucifix, we were concerned only about those conditions which are required when the crucifix used has been blessed in the ordinary way by a priest having the ordinary faculties. Of course, the Pope can modify these conditions as it may seem good to him, and can also grant special faculties to others to impart to a crucifix the indulgence of the *Via Crucis* which can be gained without the fulfilment of one or other, or any of the conditions ordinarily required. But from our correspondent we have heard for the first time of the concession made to Cardinal Melchero, as well as of the fact, if it be a fact, that the Pope is in the habit of abrogating the ordinary conditions in favour of those who have the privilege

of using a crucifix blessed by his Holiness himself. Granting, however, that the will of the Pope in either or both the cases mentioned be as our correspondent says it is, then, of course, the condition he mentions is not required when one uses a crucifix thus indulgenced.

The conditions which have been given in a former number must be fulfilled by persons who are physically able to fulfil them. For those, however, who are too sick to recite the twenty *Paters* and *Aves*, these conditions have been considerably modified. For such it is only required that they should recite an act of contrition, together with the invocation, "*Te ergo quaesumus tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemisti*:" and, in addition, accompany, at least mentally, another, reciting aloud three *Paters* and *Aves*.

Our attention has been called to this omission by the Very Rev. Dr. Melata, of Rome, the distinguished author of the *Manuale de Indulgentiis*, from which we derived most of our information regarding this matter. Dr. Melata kindly sent us the following *Instruction*, in which the conditions for those who are well and those who are sick are clearly laid down:—

"Cruces cum imaginibus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi crucifixi prominentibus, atque ex aurichalo (vulgo *ottone*) vel ex alia quacunque materia non fragili connectis, eisdemque applicandi omnes Sacrae *Pae. Cruc.* indulgentias, lucrandas ab infirmis, navigantibus, carceribus detentis, in partibus Infidelium morantibus, aliisque a visitandis cunctis *Pae. Cruc.* Stationibus legitime impeditis: dummodo recitent (iuxta Deer. *Urbis et Orbis* die 16 septembris 1859 edit.), corde saltem contrito ac devoto, *quinti Pater, Ave et Gloria*: unum nempe pro qualibet Statione, quinque in Sac. D. N. Iesu Christi Vulnerum memoriam, ac unum iuxta mentem Summi Pontificis.

"Iis vero, qui gravi morbo ita afficiuntur, ut recitandis *viginti Pater, Ave et Gloria* nunquam impares sint, ex benigna concessione Nobis facta a S. P. Leone Pp. XIII. per litteras in forma Brevis sub die 9 septembris 1890, indulgemus ut, eorum loco, recitent semel Actum contritionis, et invocationem: *Te ergo quaesumus, tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso Sanguine redemisti*; ac mente saltem sequantur recitationem ab alio adstante factam *trium Pater, Ave et Gloria*."

## BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—In the question regarding benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament, it is said—‘(2) At page 158 of *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, occur the following words:—‘Having placed the monstrance on the corporal, the officiant genuflects on one knee on the predella, while one of the clerks removes the veil from his shoulders.’ In this passage the genuflection is to be made on one knee. It is to be made on one knee, according to De Herdt and others. In England, it is made on two knees, but that is according to special rubrics for that country. What should be done in Ireland?

“Also, when the minister descends from putting the monstrance in the place reserved for it, he genuflects, *utroque genu*, on the lowest step. How is this genuflection made? It is generally an inclination of the body, especially when the humeral veil is being removed; but De Herdt says: “These genuflections should be ‘*cum capitis non autem corporis inclinatione*’ (vol. ii., No. 26.) The ‘*inclination capitis profunda*’ is only a bowing of the head, with a slightly perceptible bowing of the shoulders.

“A. B.”

We beg to refer our correspondent to the work he mentions, namely, *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, for an exhaustive explanation of all his difficulties about the ceremonies of benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament. In the same work, in a note on pp. 154-155, will be found what the author holds with regard to the binding force in this country of the instruction issued by the Synod of Thurles regarding the ceremonies to be observed by a priest giving benediction.

D. O’LOAN.

## Documents.

### CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

#### DOUBT AS TO THE POWER OF THE ORDINARY TO DISPENSE IN CERTAIN MATRIMONIAL IMPEDIMENTS.

1. An in multiplici consanguinitate, seu cum consanguineis qui ex multiplici stipite invicem coniuncti sunt, Ordinarius dispensare possit iuxta facultates a S. Sede impetratas tenoris sequentis: *Dispensandi in 3. et 4. consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradu simplici et mixto tantum, et in 2. 3. et 4. mixtis, non tamen in 2. solo quoad futura matrimonia; atque dispensandi in utroque foro pro catholicis, eius iurisdictioni subiectis in matrimoniis sive contractis, sive contrahendis super impedimento 2. gradus consanguinitatis vel affinitatis in linea transversali aequali pro centum casibus.*

2. An in multiplici affinitate dispensare possit.

R. Ad. 1. et 2. Affirmative, scilicet Episcopos qui facultate gaudent quinquenniali dispensandi in 3. et 4. consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradu simplici et mixto tantum, et in 2. 3. et 4. non tamen in 2. solo quoad futura matrimonia, posse dispensare in 3. 3., in 4. et 4., in 3. mixto cum 4.; nec non in 3. et 4. cum 2. mixtis, sive gradus oriatur ex uno sive ex multiplici stipite.

SSñus approbavit.

### CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES.

#### VARIOUS QUESTIONS REGARDING THE "BENEDICTIO IN ARTICULO MORTIS."

Utrum sufficiat recitatio Confessionis, id est *Confiteor etc.*, in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ habita, pro recitatione illius præscriptæ, quando impertienda est benedictio cum Indulgentia in mortis articulo?—2. Utrum necesse sit tribus vicibus recitare, *Confiteor etc.*, quando administratur Sacrum Viaticum, Extrema Unctio, ac Indulgentia in mortis articulo impertitur? 3. Utrum infirmus lucrari possit Indulgentiam plenariam in mortis articulo a pluribus sacerdotibus facultatem habentibus impertiendam? 4. Utrum sacerdos valide conferat Indulgentiam plenariam in articulo



mortis, omissa formula a Summo Pontifice praescripta, ob libri deficientiam?

R.—Ad 1. Negative, iuxta praxim et Rubricas, nisi necessitas urgeat.—Ad 2. Affirmative, iuxta praxim et Rubricas.—Ad 3. Negative in eodem mortis articulo.—Ad 4. Negative, quia formula non est tantum directiva, sed praeceptiva.

# SOLUTION OF QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PIOUS ASSOCIATION OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

## SUMMARY.

It is sufficient to register the name of the head of a family. He then declares the number of which the family is composed and all share in the Indulgences. The registry need not be signed by the Parish Priest at the foot of every page; his signature at the end is sufficient. The form of enrolment is similar to that of all pious associations, viz.: Diocese of ———, Parish ———, In the year 18—, month of ———, day of ———, Mr. N ——— (Head of Family) was enrolled in the Pious Association of the Holy Family. ——— with ———. (Signature of Parish Priest). Religious communities may be considered as families in the same sense.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—May I ask you to publish the enclosed document I have just received from Rome, in reference to some disputed points connected with the ‘Pious Association of the Holy Family’?—Yours faithfully in Christ,

“M. O’CALLAGHAN, C.M.

“ST. VINCENT’S, CORK, *July 30, 1893.*”

IL SOTTO SCRITTO PRO-SEGRET<sup>o</sup> DELL’ ASSNE DELLA S. FAMIGLIA A NOME DI S. E. RMO. IL CARD. VICARIO RISPONDE AI DUBBI PREPOSTI.

1. Se sia sufficiente d’ registrare il nome del Capo della Famiglia e se in questo caso i membri partecipino a tutte le indulgenze. Affermat: il Capo di famiglia però dichiarare il numero dei membri componenti la famiglia.

2. Se il Registro del Parroco debba essere sotto-segnato in ogni Pagina: Risp: Non e’ necessario; basta la firma in fine.

3. Qual sia la formola del certificato etc.

Una dichiarazione colla quale il Parroco certifichi l’ascrizione. simile alle altre relative a Pie Aggregazioni. P. E.— Dioces, di . .

Parrocchia . . . Nell' anno 18 . . . mese . . . giorno . . .  
e stato aggregato alla Pia Associazione della S. F. il Sig . . .  
(Capo di casa), . . . con . . . Il Parroco . . .

4. Se le Comuniti Religiose debbano considerarsi come  
Famiglie deregistrassi nel medesimo modo.

Affirm.

Rom. Del. Vicariato 24 Luglio 1893.

A. RAFFAELE C. LAURENTI,

*Pro-Segret. dell' assie della S. F.*

## Notices of Books.

BRENDANIANA: ST. BRENDAN THE VOYAGER, IN STORY  
AND LEGEND. By the Rev. Denis O'Donoghue, P.P.,  
Ardfert. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1893.

THIS book, the author tells us, is "A miscellaneous collection of matters and things relating to St. Brendan, the patron of the dioceses of Clonfert and Ardfert." Three of the pieces in this collection together give an outline of the saint's life: but, unfortunately, it is very difficult to separate what is authentic history from the very large mass of romantic fiction with which the pieces abound. The facts are, to use the author's words, "often disguised or distorted by a parasitical growth of extravagant legend, which twined round the name and fame of St. Brendan in singular luxuriance."

The first of the three pieces, of which we have just spoken, is the *Betha Brenainn*, or Irish Life of St. Brendan, from the *Book of Lismore*. Irish scholars and students will feel grateful to Father O'Donoghue for giving the Irish text, while those who cannot read Irish must thank him for the excellent English translation which accompanies the text, and is printed on alternate pages with it. The portion of the *Betha Brenainn* given here contains the outlines of the life of St. Brendan up to his setting sail on his famous series of voyages. It is a brief, simple narrative, containing, of course, many more or less credible wonders; but conveying, on the whole, the impression that the main facts have been correctly stated.

The second piece gives an account of the voyages of

St. Brendan, translated from the Latin work, entitled, *Navigatio Sti. Brendani*. The Irish manuscript, from which the first piece was taken, contains also an account of these voyages, but only in "a fragmentary and imperfect form." Hence, Father O'Donoghue deemed it better to give here the fuller and more popular account contained in the Latin version, contenting himself with giving, in an introduction, a summary of the tale from the Irish manuscript. This story "was the most widely popular 'Tale of the Sea' in the middle ages, and passed in various shapes and versions into almost every language and dialect of mediæval Europe." The story may be an allegory, but it is certainly not an account of things which actually took place. Many of the incidents are naturally impossible; and are, at the same time so childish, that one could hardly look for miraculous intervention. Notwithstanding this—or rather, perhaps, by reason of this—the story is most interesting; it is quite consecutive, and maintains throughout a wonderful self-consistency. Is the story a mere work of the imagination, or does it rest on a substratum of fact? The answer now given to this question is that the main fact of the story—namely, that St. Brendan was a renowned "Voyager" or sailor—cannot be called in question. Moreover, there are many, and their numbers are increasing, among whom Father O'Donoghue is to be numbered, who hold that St. Brendan did actually reach the Continent of America on one of his "Voyages."

The life of St. Brendan, from his return to Ireland, after his wanderings, is taken from a Latin Life of great historical value. It contains, besides the outlines of St. Brendan's life, many references to contemporary saints, and to the manners of the people.

These three pieces are preceded by a very learned and very interesting account of the ancient cathedral of Ardfert, illustrated with plans, &c., and followed by "Legends of St. Brendan," "Vestiges of Pre-historic Irish Settlements and Missions in North America." An account of a pilgrimage to Brandon Mountain on June 28, 1868; and an Appendix, containing an early English Metrical, and an early English Prose Life of St. Brendan. The whole, and especially the *Betha Brenainn* is copiously illustrated, with notes by the learned and painstaking author.

Both Father O'Donoghue and the publishers are to be congratulated on the style in which this volume has been brought out.

THE PHYSICAL SYSTEM OF ST. THOMAS. By Father Giovanni Maria Coonoldi, S.J. Translated by Edward Heneage Dering.

In a brief preface the author explains the object he had in view in writing this work. Having for many years discharged the duties of Professor of Philosophy in Rome he was obliged to combat the serious devices put forward as enlightened philosophy by the enemies of the Church, for the purpose, if possible, of drawing away men's minds from the Church and from Christianity. At first, these so-called philosophers roamed at large through the dark domain of metaphysics. Kant and Hegel and Schelling, and the whole brood of German transcendentalists, were held up to their pupils as the only sound thinkers, as the only real authority in speculative science, by professors, ignorant alike of the systems they professed to admire, and of those they so warmly condemned. Such men could not fail to make metaphysics odious to every student, and ridiculous to men of independent thought. Then Freemasonry finding this much-vaunted weapon, with which it proposed to destroy the Church, turned against itself, dropped it, and took up in its stead two others more subtle and dangerous—positivism and materialism.

These two ungodly systems are promoted chiefly by those who cultivate the physical sciences. And it is against these that this treatise has been written. The author hopes, and with good reason, that if the physical system of the Angel of the Schools were thoroughly understood by Catholic students, the shallow sophisms of the materialist and the positivist would excite his ridicule rather than undermine his faith. But, then, a thorough knowledge of the Angelic Doctor's teaching is required; better eschew philosophy altogether than merely dabble in it.

"Many [writes our author] who have a great reverence for the wisdom of the Angelic Doctor, and, in obedience to the Vicar of Jesus Christ, declare their adhesion to his doctrines, know too little of the fundamental questions that belong to physics. Many have confused ideas about them, and, therefore, are liable to be taken in by the sophisms and the authority of men who pass as wise and learned in such things. Hence, they either give in or vacillate, accepting as probable what is not only improbable, but also absurd and bad."

To our mind, this book appears admirably suited to attain the end for which it was written. Though the subject is, from its



very nature abstruse, yet the author, by the marvellous clearness with which he treats it, and the copious use of familiar illustrations, has succeeded in making the most difficult questions quite intelligible to even the ordinary mind. We heartily commend the book to students, lay as well as clerical—to the former, that they may not be deceived by infidel books and infidel teachers; to the latter, that they may be able to distinguish between the wholesome and the poisonous pasture for the flock of Christ.

D. O'L.

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF KILKENNY, COUNTY AND CITY. With Illustrations and Appendix. Compiled from Inquisitions, Deeds, Wills, Funeral Entries, Family Records, and other Historical and Authentic Sources. By the Rev. William Healy, P.P. Kilkenny: P. M. Egan. 1893.

EVERY student of Irish history will welcome this latest contribution to the history of our country. For its own intrinsic merits the book deserves the highest commendation. The author has gone to the most authentic sources for the stores of information with which he has literally crammed his book. He has exercised, too, the soundest critical judgment in his use of these sources, and has displayed nice literary taste and acumen in the style in which he has put the result of his laborious investigations before his readers. But apart altogether from the intrinsic merits of the book, there is another and higher reason why students of Irish history should wish it a hearty *cead míle fáilte*. All are agreed that a good history of Ireland has yet to be written, and that such a history can never be written until what Father Healy has done for Kilkenny County and City has been done for every county and city, if not for every parish, in the country. We welcome this book, therefore, chiefly because it gives indication that in course of time—soon, we hope—industrious and erudite men, copying the example of Father Healy, will do, each for his own district, what he has done for Kilkenny. A good deal has already been done in this direction in many parts of Ireland, but much remains. We sincerely trust that the rich and already over-ripe harvest will soon find a sufficient number of able and earnest workmen.

The body of this book is made up of notes on the Inquisitions

taken in the County Kilkenny from the time of Philip and Mary to the end of the reign of James I., the first bearing date 1557-58, and being the only one in that reign; and the last which has a date having been taken in Callan on the 21st October, 1621. The Inquisitions are given, in an English translation, at the beginning of a chapter, and each one of them—though many of them are made up of but a few lines—is illustrated with many pages of notes. These notes form the staple portion of the book, and give to it all its interest. Taken together, they contain a copious and connected history, not merely of Kilkenny, but of Ireland and her affairs generally. The book is a storehouse of archæology, biography, topography, and general history. The author has not confined himself either to the period over which the Inquisitions which he is annotating extend, but traces the fate and fortunes of the various families mentioned in these Inquisitions down to the present time, or at least to the time when the family became extinct, or was merged in another. In every war waged in Ireland, and in nearly every important battle fought in these wars, some member of some Kilkenny family, mentioned in one or other of the Inquisitions, took part: and this gives our author an opportunity of discussing these wars and describing these battles. The Battle of the Boyne, the Siege of Limerick, and many other historic engagements, thus become legitimate subjects for his facile and graceful pen.

In an appendix the author gives, from the original manuscript preserved in the Record Office, Dublin, *The Book of Survey and Distribution of County Kilkenny*. This is made up of the names of the proprietors of the lands of Kilkenny before the ill-fated year 1641, together with the extent of their possessions, and of the names of those to whom, after that year, the confiscated land was given, and the amount of acres given to each. A comparison of the names of the old and new proprietors makes it plain that Catholics had to submit to wholesale robbery, and that with their goods Protestants, English and Scotch, were enriched.

The first four chapters of the book are taken up with a synopsis of early Irish history. In our opinion, Father Healy made a mistake in introducing these chapters. He has no new light to throw on those ancient bardic tales, which have been already discussed *ad nauseam*. He is not even clear or precise in his references to what everyone knows already. In discussing the oft-discussed question regarding the country to which the

ancient name Scotia originally belonged, he is more than obscure in explaining the reason why the name came to be given to modern Scotland.

We are glad to find that Kilkenny can boast of a publisher able to turn out work like the present handsome volume.

**THE MONK'S PARDON.** A Historical Romance of the Time of Philip IV. of Spain. From the French of Raoul de Naveray. By Anna J. Sadlier, Author of "Names that Live in Catholic Hearts. Fourth Edition. Dublin : Gill & Son, O'Connell-street.

THIS is a short thrilling story without a single uninteresting chapter. It gives the reader a vivid insight into the Catholic life of Spain during the seventeenth century, when, according to the author, "everything seemed to bloom at once in that wonderful country. While Nuguel Cervantes related with subtle irony the adventures of the last knight of Spain, "The Tisserand of Segovia," the "Secret Offence" and "Secret Vengeance," all magnificent dramas, the beauty of which has never been surpassed, drew crowds to the theatre. Whilst Cervantes' book was read, and the dramas of Calderon were being performed, Murillo was painting his Madonnas, Turbaran reproducing his austere Monks, Rebera representing the Martyrdom of Saints with flashes of genius that resembled rage; and Velasquez, the friend of the king, was planning the downfall of Olivarez while painting his marvellous portraits and scenes of common life. Alonso Cano, the hero of the story, was an artist of the same rank as Murillo and Velasquez, and is known as the Michael Angelo of Spain. He was a painter, a sculptor, and an architect. His life, as told in this book, is a record of romantic situations, terrible sorrows, and strange turns of fortune. The opening chapter discovers him in his studio surrounded by the creations of his genius, attended by his admiring pupils, happy in the society of a young and beautiful wife, and basking in the smile of his Sovereign Philip IV. The last chapter introduces him changed in everything except his great nobility of soul. The history of the transformations takes us through ever-varying scenes. We are introduced to the lowest dungeon of a Spanish prison, and cannot but wonder how a man could live there for four months and not go mad. We are taken into the torture-room, and can hear the groans of an innocent man vainly protesting that he is not guilty. We are afforded an

opportunity of witnessing the procession through Madrid on the Feast of Corpus Christi. We are permitted to penetrate the interior of a Carthusian monastery. We are permitted again to look behind the scenes in a gambling den. The translator has done her task admirably. She is entitled to the gratitude of Catholics for having given us a story in which our boys and girls may learn the great Christian lessons of patience and charity. Books of this class are just now very much needed, and the author who gives us an antidote against the unwholesome literature of the day, in the shape of good Catholic story, ought to be encouraged to continue this seasonable work.

T. P. G.

A MIXED MARRIAGE. By Lady Amabel Kerr. London : Art and Book Co., 1893.

MOST stories finish abruptly with the marriage of the hero and heroine. It was impossible that this one should conform to the conventional type. In it, not the lover life, but the married life, of the hero and heroine, is the picture which the gifted authoress proposes to delineate. Hence, after a short and uneventful courtship, in which the course of true love runs quite smoothly, she marries the young, handsome, wealthy, aristocratic, high and dry Protestant, Lord Alne, to Margaret Bligh, a devout Catholic, and the only child of her widowed mother, whose husband, Colonel Bligh, had died when his daughter was a little baby, leaving wife and child in genteel poverty. Before their marriage, Margaret had resolutely insisted that Lord Alne should promise to abide by the conditions required by the Catholic Church in giving a dispensation to a Catholic to marry a heretic. He loved her so madly that he consented. And when their first child was born, he had her baptized by the priest, and consented to her mother's request that she should be called Gertrude Mary. But as time went on, Lord Alne began to repent of his promise. Evil counsellors were around him, chief of whom was his own mother: the poison was instilled into his heart, and when the next child, a son and heir, was born, he had him baptized in the Protestant Cathedral of Ulminster. When the boy had attained the age of seven, his father, in order to remove him from the "popish" influence of his mother, sent him off to a public school, and would not permit him even to come home during his holidays. Lord and Lady Alne naturally became estranged.



They had no confidence in each other. She was punctilious in the discharge of her duties as Lady Alne, but she took every opportunity of letting him know that she felt his treatment of her with regard to her son. Years pass away, and they at last become reconciled. Their son Ashton is now a young man of eighteen, remarkable only for idleness and its accompanying vice. His pious mother can have no hope for his spiritual, or even his temporal welfare, and she is obliged to die with the conviction that her son, through the baneful influence of her husband, will be lost. The one consolation that remains to the poor dying Lady Alne is that Gertrude Mary, influenced by her mother's pious example, and drawn on by the grace of God, has become a holy Carmelite nun.

Apart altogether from the important moral of this tale, Lady Kerr has succeeded in writing a most interesting story, and has displayed very considerable literary and dramatic power.

D. O'L.

THE WITNESS OF THE SAINTS : OR, THE SAINTS AND THE CHURCH. By Henry Sebastian Bowden, of the Oratory, London : Burns & Oates, 1893.

THIS is a reprint of the Introduction to Virtue's edition of *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, published in 1893. It is divided into five chapters, the first of which forms an introduction to the other four. In these four the author demonstrates from the lives and works of holy men and women four "notes" of the true Church—her unity, her sanctity, her catholicity, and her apostolicity. This idea is original, and is worked out with great skill. The book bears ample testimony to the author's acquaintance with the lives and writings of the saints, and it is an additional proof of his fine literary style. For good, wholesome instruction and suggestive reading, we heartily commend the *Witness of the Saints*.

D. O'L.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1893.

## FURTHER THOUGHTS ON THE HOLY EUCCHARIST.

“ Verbum caro, panem verum  
Verbo carnem efficit :  
Fitque sanguis Christi merum  
ET SI SENSUS DEFICIT :  
AD FIRMANDUM COR SINCERUM  
SOLA TIBES SUFFICIT.”

### I.

THE two greatest mysteries in connection with the Holy Eucharist are Transubstantiation and Multiplication. To understand the precise meaning of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we must endeavour to acquire the clearest idea possible of the difference between substance and accidents. Every object in creation is made up of these two parts. By the substance we mean a thing's very essence. By the accidents we mean its mere qualities. The word “ substance ” is from the Latin *sub*, and *stare*, *i.e.*, to stand under, to support, sustain. Substance, therefore, is that which supports the qualities perceived by our senses; that which lies behind the phenomena; that, in a word, in which the attributes and accidents of a thing may be said to reside. The accidents, on the other hand, are the mere qualities inherent in the substance; that which the substance supports; those external appearances or evidences by which the existence of the substance is recognised and made known to us.

An example will make this clear. A piece of iron ore is put into my hand. The first thing that strikes me is that it

is very heavy. Then I notice, further, that it is of a certain shape, size, colour, hardness, temperature, taste ; that when struck it emits a certain sound, &c. By these and similar indications I am led to the conclusion that what I hold in my hand is a piece of iron. Yet neither the weight, size, colour, temperature, taste, &c., is iron ; nor do all these added together constitute iron. And this is clear, since everyone of these qualities might be changed without in any way changing the substance. This is evident as regards the size and the shape ; but the same holds good of all else. Thus, the dull blackish colour, by the application of heat, becomes a brilliant red ; by the application of greater heat, it becomes a glowing white ; yet it never ceases to be iron. So with regard to hardness. Cast the iron into the furnace, and though now soft and limpid as water, it is the same substance as before. There is no quality of which this may not be said. Take, for example, that quality which seems particularly inherent in all metals, *i.e.*, weight. Iron is heavy. True, but even heaviness is not of the essence of iron. Since it depends upon attraction, it will change according to circumstances, and under certain conditions disappear altogether. A cubic foot of iron, if transferred to the moon, will weigh less than at the surface of the earth, but a great deal more if deposited on the outer crust of the planet Saturn. Were every other material object annihilated, it would lose its entire weight, yet it would certainly not cease on that account to be iron. Again, the sound iron emits on being struck depends entirely upon its shape and size, &c. All these are mere qualities, and not even necessary qualities of the substance ; and because not essential, we call them accidents. Yet, observe, it is *only by these and similar accidents* that the bare existence of the substance is made manifest to us.

Of substance in itself we know really nothing. If asked what the substance of such a familiar thing as iron is, we must confess our ignorance. We cannot tell. No living man has ever seen it. It is neither weight, nor shape, nor colour, nor taste, nor sound. Such phenomena simply indicate and inform us of the presence of a substance ; the substance itself always eludes our grasp. It is just as invisible to our

eyes, just as impervious to our senses, as the spirit of an archangel. All substances—as distinct from accidents—are denizens of the invisible world. No man hath seen them at any time.

Let us apply this to the adorable mystery of the Holy Eucharist. I ascend the altar to say Mass, and taking a piece of bread I hold it before me, and pronounce the solemn words of consecration; and by the infinite power of God the “mystery of faith” is wrought. The substance of bread is no longer there. In its place there is the substance of the Body of Christ. Can I detect the change? As has been already pointed out, we cannot see any substance whatsoever; therefore we cannot see the substance of bread. But as it is impossible to see the substance of bread, of course we cannot see that another substance has been substituted for it.

All that we can see, touch, or taste, are the accidents, but they have not been changed, nor in any way affected. There is no miracle therefore in the fact that when we look at a consecrated host, we do not see the substance of Christ’s Body. The miracle would be if we did. All that we see after the consecration is just precisely what we saw before the consecration, viz., the accidents of bread. And our senses are not deceived, for the things we see are really there, viz., the *accidents* of bread—the invisible *substance* alone having departed.

Transubstantiation then means that on the due recitation of certain words by a properly ordained minister, God by His omnipotence transubstantiates the substance—not the accidents—of bread into His own sacred Body, so that what was just now bread is no longer bread, but the living Flesh of the Son of God.

Now it certainly seems, at first blush, a most marvellous and unheard-of thing to change wheaten bread into a living human organism! And it is undoubtedly a stupendous mystery. Yet, after all, is it not very much what every man, woman, and child is doing each day of their lives? I must not be understood to press the analogy too far, but the analogy is worth pointing out. When a man sits down



at table, and feeds himself on bread and wine, what becomes of that food? Is it not gradually changed into his own body and blood? Does it not in very truth enter into the composition of his own substance? Is it not an undeniable physiological fact, that what is bread and wine to-day may be flesh and blood and bone to-morrow?

Why the very purpose of food is to keep the body in repair. Particle by particle, and molecule by molecule, the entire body crumbles away. It needs to be constantly rebuilt; and every effete cell and exhausted atom is replaced by a fresh atom formed from the food. Medical men assure us that our bodies are undergoing a continual process of destruction and reconstruction. This goes on ceaselessly till at last no single fibre of any limb or organ of our former body remains. The entire organism has been fashioned from the bread and wine, or other food on which we have lived. If a man live exclusively on bread and wine, then *the bread and wine become literally changed into his body and blood!*

This change of common bread and wine by the natural processes of nutrition, digestion, and assimilation, into the complex and extremely intricate form of the human body, is indeed a mystery in the order of nature. It is a change wrought by the omnipotence of the Creator, who has made all our organs and prescribed to each organ its special functions.

Now, let me ask: Since God enables us to change bread and wine into our body and blood by the ordinary physical processes, why should He not enable us (if He so please) to do the same thing *instantly*? And if into the substance of our own bodies, why not (supposing a sufficient motive) into the substance of His own sacred Body, which is as truly human as our own?

Having suggested this similitude I must not fail to point out that the analogy can help us only to a limited extent. There are many and stupendous differences between the change of bread into flesh by the natural process of digestion, and the change of bread into the human flesh of Christ by means of the words of consecration.

It will be enough here to note some of the most striking.

1. In Transubstantiation the substance of bread is changed into the adorable Body of Christ not indirectly but directly ; not by any gradual process, but by the *direct* power of God, and instantly. And further, the *whole substance* of bread is changed into the *whole substance* of Christ's Body.

2. In Transubstantiation the substance is changed, not so as to form what till then had no existence, but into that which already existed. That is to say : before the consecrating words are spoken, our Lord's sacred Body exists in heaven, perfect, entire, and wanting in nothing, and by virtue of the words of consecration the bread resting on the altar is changed, *not into a new Body*, but into that very pre-existing Body.

3. The Body into which the substance of bread is changed in the Mass, is a spiritual Body—a true Body indeed, possessing all its constituent parts and organs, but spiritualized, incorruptible, immortal, and glorious.

4. And, as a consequence of its spiritualized state, and because it is “a glorified Body,” it is not only present throughout the consecrated Host, but is wholly present in every portion of it.

## II.

Let us now make a few remarks upon the second great miracle in connection with the Holy Eucharist, viz., the multiplication of the real Presence. We must observe, at starting, that the word “multiplication” is to be applied, not to Christ, but to His sacred Presence. If two priests are celebrating Mass at the same moment, one in London and the other in Sydney, what happens when they come to the words of consecration? There is a glorified Body in the London church, but is there *another* glorified Body in the Sydney church? No! Not *another*. It is the same sacred Body in both places. And so, in every tabernacle in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, there is present the *one and only Body* of Jesus Christ. Hence, it is not our Lord's Body that is multiplied, but merely the presence of that one Body in ten thousand times ten thousand places. And just as

Christ foreshadowed the mystery of transubstantiation, by changing water into wine, so did He also foreshadow the multiplication of His sacramental presence by the multiplication of the loaves and fishes in the desert.

Let us, for a moment, consider that incident in our Lord's life. We are told in the fourteenth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel that a great multitude followed our Lord into the desert, and our Lord had compassion on them and healed their sick; and, "When it was evening His disciples came to Him, saying, This is a desert place, and the hour is now past; send away the multitudes, that, going into the towns, they may buy themselves food. But Jesus said, They have no need to go: give you them to eat. They answered Him, We have here but five loaves and two fishes. And when He had commanded the multitude to sit down upon the grass, He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven He blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to His disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. And they did *all* eat, and were filled. And they took up what remained, twelve full baskets of fragments. And the number of them that did eat was five thousand *men*, besides women and children."

Now, observe here that Jesus Christ fed five thousand men, not counting women and children. How many women and children there were is not stated, but probably they were present in larger numbers than the men. Even if we put them down as only a corresponding number, viz., five thousand women and five thousand children, that would bring up the total to fifteen thousand. Yet, they were all fed, and fed so well, that when they had finished, twelve baskets full of fragments remained. But *how* did Jesus Christ manage to feed so many? He might have done it in one of two ways: 1, He might have used the five loaves, and then have created some thousands of other loaves, so that each man, woman, and child should be provided with a loaf; or, 2, He might, without creating a single new loaf, have caused the five loaves to be miraculously present in many places. Had He adopted the *first* method, and created fresh loaves, He would, indeed, have wrought a great miracle; but

that would not have been "feeding the multitude with *five* loaves," but with five *plus* the thousand just created. In other words, a great miracle would have been worked, but an **entirely different miracle.**

Now, the Scripture represents our Lord feeding the multitudes with only five loaves. St. John even, speaking of the fragments which remained over, when all had had their fill, distinctly says that they "filled twelve baskets with the fragments" (not of so many thousand loaves, but) "of the *five* barley loaves." (John vi. 13.) In other words, Jesus Christ multiplied not the *five* barley loaves, but the presence of these loaves, so that each loaf must have been present at one and the same time in the hands of several, and must have been eaten and digested at the same time by a considerable number. In fact, just as at Holy Communion, many persons receive the selfsame Body of Jesus Christ (though the accidents of each separate particle are distinct), so on that wonderful occasion, many persons received the selfsame loaf.

How is it possible to render the same substance present in many distant places at the same moment? Well, if we knew more about the nature of substance—if it were something familiar to us—we might possibly discover some more satisfying answer. Since, however, as we have already pointed out, we have never seen, nor felt, nor touched, nor come in direct communication with any substance whatsoever, since no man has ever seen or known substance, it is hardly to be wondered at that we cannot explain the prodigy.

It is a mystery, but it is by no means the *only* mystery. Is not life itself a mystery? Are not birth, and death, and sensation mysteries? To deny a thing merely because it is mysterious, is to deny half the facts of history and of science. We have God's authority for it, and the clear and express declaration of His infallible Church, and that is enough.

Now, what does the Church teach. She teaches that Jesus Christ is truly and really and substantially present wherever the Blessed Sacrament is received; wherever Mass is said, and wherever the Communion is given. Consequently, if a hundred persons go to Holy Communion at the same time, it



follows that the sacred Body of Christ rests upon one hundred different tongues: in other words, is present in one hundred different places. Each communicant receives, not a portion only, but the entire Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Christ. It is not that there are one hundred sacred bodies, certainly not; there is but one Body of Jesus Christ; but that one body is in one hundred different places, and has been given to one hundred different people, and each receives as all, and all as each. Though God gives all He has and is, He is none the poorer; and though He were to give to a single individual what He gives to the thousand, the individual receives no more than before.

Let us try to illustrate this in some way. The Scripture itself seems to suggest an illustration. It often speaks of our Lord as the *Word* of the Father; e.g., *Verbum caro factum est*; the Word was made Flesh. But let us take an ordinary word—a human word. Consider what an illustration it affords us. I utter a word, and at once that word is intimately present with each one who hears it. That word in its entirety penetrates into every ear that is open to sound. If but one person be present, he receives the word in its entirety. If five hundred or a thousand persons be present, each individual of that multitude receives the same word in its entirety. No one receives more than another; each has what the other has; no more, no less. But a single word has been uttered. It has been uttered but once, and yet all have received it; not merely a similar word, but the selfsame; and whether the audience be many or few it makes not the slightest difference; the *single* word issuing out of my mouth reaches with equal completeness, unbroken and undivided, everyone present. A beautiful image, surely, of the Word of God, the Eternal Word made flesh, produced by the Father by an eternal generation, entering into the soul of every communicant.

We may still further illustrate the Catholic doctrine by pointing out another name of Jesus Christ. He is spoken of as the Wisdom of the Father; or, again, as the Truth. Indeed it is thus that Jesus Christ speaks of Himself. "I am the way, the *truth*, and the life." Suppose a man

acquires a knowledge of certain truths. Suppose, *e.g.*, he has travelled into some foreign land; he comes home; he writes a book; he gets fifty thousand copies printed; he gives a copy to fifty thousand different people. Now, in a book we have two totally distinct things—in the first place, we have the story, the narrative, the facts recounted, which I will call the truth of the book: and, in the second place, we have the paper, the leaves, the type, the letterpress, the punctuation, which do not indeed constitute the truth, but which are merely the channel by which the truth is conveyed to us. The first I call the substance of the book: the latter I call the accidents. Put these fifty thousand copies of the book into the hands of fifty thousand different men. What is the result? Well, the result is that each man possesses—(1) the *entire* truth, and (2) the *exact* truth, and (3) the *same* truth. The accidents may be different in each, but the substance is the same; and not only similar, but identical. Each book may vary in size, weight, type, paper, material, binding, &c. It makes no difference. There is not *one* truth in one volume and another in another, but the same truth is present wherever there is a copy of the book; and if there be fifty thousand copies, then the same truth, whole and entire, is equally present in fifty thousand different places. And further, whether a man receive but one copy, or whether he receive fifty copies, or even the whole edition of fifty thousand volumes, he will have the same truth, neither more nor less, than if he had received but *one*.

So in the Blessed Sacrament, if one hundred particles are consecrated, the incarnate Wisdom of God is present under each: just as the wisdom of any author is present in each of a hundred volumes. Again, as the shape and form of the pages and letters—whether large or small, Roman or Gothic, are merely *accidental* differences, and just as the same truth is equally present whether in small type or large type, so the same Jesus Christ is equally present whether the accidents of the Host, *i.e.*, the shape, colour, and size, be the same or different. This is, of course, only an analogy; a mere illustration, and not to be pressed too far: for

whereas in a book the truth is merely expressed by signs, in the Blessed Sacrament the Eternal Truth, *i. e.*, the infinite God is substantially present in His human and divine nature.

Many heretics not only deny this to be the case, but (what is a totally different thing) they deny even its possibility, for they deny that any substance can be present in more than one place at the same time. Yet such an objection cannot be seriously maintained, even by a Protestant. They may deny the *truth* of the multiplication of Christ's presence, just as they deny the infallibility of the Pope, and other Catholic doctrines, but they cannot deny its *possibility* without stultifying themselves, since they do admit the principle in the case of other substances; *e. g.*, they admit that God is *everywhere*; and wholly, substantially, and personally present in every place. God is here. God is there. God is within the Church, without the Church; He is on land and sea, and in the most distant stars, substantially and personally present. "If I ascend into heaven, He is there; if I descend into hell, He is there." Yet not divided—not *in part* here, and in part there, but wholly everywhere. It is one and the same God who is here, and who is there. If then God can be wholly present in every place, why may not His sacred humanity be at least in many places?

It may be urged, God is the uncreated, and the humanity of Jesus Christ is created. Well then let us take a created object, viz., the soul of man. What do philosophers and metaphysicians teach regarding the soul? They tell us that the soul has no extension; no parts beyond parts; and yet, that it is present throughout the whole of the sensitive body. For instance, they assure me that my soul is wholly in my right arm; and wholly in my left; wholly in my brain, and wholly in my heart; consequently the same indivisible soul is present in many different places at the same moment: not merely by its effects, but substantially present.

This is a doctrine taught by the greatest and profoundest of metaphysicians: not only by Catholics, observe; not only by such intellectual giants as St. Augustine, St. Thomas,

### *Further Thoughts on the Holy Eucharist.*

and Suarez and De Lugo, and others, but by Protestants, and even pagans.

Aristotle, the disciple of Plato, who flourished more than three hundred years before Christ, taught that the soul is "all in the whole body, and all in every part;" and he (though a pagan) is reputed as the greatest philosopher that ever lived. There is, therefore, evidently nothing repugnant in itself to a substance being in more than one place at once. Protestant philosophers say the same; thus the Scotch Presbyterian Hamilton writes:—"The supposition that the soul (or the mind, as he calls it) is really present wherever we are conscious that it acts—in other words, the peripatetic aphorism—the soul is all in the whole and all in every part—is more philosophical, and consequently more probable, than any other opinion," and "we have no right to say it is limited to any one part of the organism."<sup>1</sup>

Now, if Protestants, and even the very pagans, admit that the soul, not merely may be, but actually is, present in many places at once; *e.g.*, in one's eyes when one sees, in one's ears when one hears, in one's tongue when one speaks, and so of every other part of the human body, and not *partly* in one place, and *partly* in another, but wholly in each; the principle that a substance may co-exist at one and the same moment in different places is clearly conceded. And if the substance of the soul, why not the substance of the human nature of Christ?

As to explaining "how." Well; it will be time enough to explain how *Christ* is present in many places at once, when philosophers have made it clear how the *soul* may be, and is at present, in many different places at once. One thing is abundantly proved, *viz.*, that nothing in the doctrines of the Church, however wonderful, is contrary to reason. Many things are beyond and above the reach of man's unaided reason; but no one can show that the Church teaches anything whatsoever in contradiction with it.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton, vol. ii., pp. 127, 128.



## THE MASS OF THE APOSTLES.

THAT the Apostles said Mass, is a statement that every Catholic gives immediate assent to. For a Catholic, it is not even necessary to go through a process of reasoning to persuade oneself of it; because Holy Mass is so vital a portion of the Christian religion that a Catholic cannot conceive the Catholic religion to be existing without Holy Mass being existing also. That the form of consecration used by the Apostles is identical with that used at present by all the priests of the Catholic Church, is certain; but that the ritual preceding the consecration, and that succeeding it, were different, there can hardly be a doubt. The reason of this change will be explained later on in its own place; but, first, let the difficulty be stated.

The ritual and liturgy of the Apostles have been impugned very seriously by non-Catholics. Those who do not believe in the adorable mystery of the Real Presence, or in the efficacy of the words of consecration to change the bread and wine of the altar into the real and true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, appeal to the liturgy and ritual of the Apostles for corroboration; and if the liturgy of the Apostles bore them out, it may be almost safe to say that they have carried their case in the face of the world triumphantly. If, in the history of the Christian Church, there had never been such a thing as the Protestant Reformation, it is possible that up to this the liturgy and ritual of the Apostles may have remained venerated, but unknown; or, at most, not critically known to the *savants* of the Western Church. But the philosophers and scholars who sided with the new doctrines in the sixteenth century, boasted that the Catholic Church would not stand the test of antiquity, and they threw down the liturgy of the Apostles as a gage to all comers. From their view they could not have lighted on a better point about which to contend, for two or three reasons. First, the liturgies of the Apostles had not been called in question for the last fifteen centuries—indeed, never at all, and were, consequently, matter on which ecclesiastical

scholars were not thoroughly prepared to meet adversaries. Second, those liturgies were buried in the (at that time) unknown eastern languages, the Egyptian (or Coptic), the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Hebrew. Third (and this being the case), it came to be a question of scholarship and authority, rather than of right and wrong, of the comparative dialectical abilities of the disputants, than of what the originals said.

There was a further advantage to the impugnors of the doctrine of the Real Presence in this choice of ground: the question in dispute being so little known, it divided the natural defenders of the liturgies into two parties, not indeed openly hostile or antagonistic to each other, but (as will happen with the defenders of different opinions) unallied, ungenerous, and covertly rejoicing in each other's mistakes or misfortunes. One party thought that the copies of the liturgies then forthcoming could not be defended, because of the abiding and widely-diffused doubt in their genuineness. This party went for surrendering the bulwark of the Church's defence into the hands of the enemy, on account of the state of the bulwark. The other party felt that the liturgies formed a very solid defence, if their genuineness could be proved, or if they were restored to a state of genuineness. The multitude were of the former opinion, to wit, that after fifteen centuries it was useless work trying to restore them; those who had critically studied the question held the possibility of putting them in a state of defence. Of these, many attempted by dissertations and otherwise to place the question of their genuineness beyond cavil. In this, as has been hinted at, they had to face, not alone the avowed and open hostility of opponents, but also the private criticism and railery of those on their own side who did not adopt their views to the full. Indeed, it all but became a note or mark of doubtful orthodoxy to be inoculated with a taste for searching into those old liturgies; and it is said that Erasmus hardly escaped the imputation, although defended by the Pope.

The efforts of some also, who sought to uphold the old liturgies, did, by their imprudent zeal, by their indiscrimina-

tion, and by their weak and inconclusive arguments, but serve to bring ridicule, as well as greater doubt, on the truth and genuineness of those documents they professed to maintain and the opinion they meant to serve. The first who succeeded in doing real effective service was a learned writer of the Dominican Order.

“At length [says Renaudot], in the year 1647, Jacobus Goar, a ripe scholar of the Dominican Order, produced his famous work, in which he illustrated the Euchologium of the Greeks, and accompanied it with an explanatory Latin version. By this means he brought before the eyes of the world the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, as well as ceremonies relating to the Divine Eucharist, and those things in particular which had been most difficult and least known. No such work, or anything like it, has been produced in our day.”<sup>1</sup>

About the same time the attacking party put forward two champions, Joseph Scaliger and Claudius Salmasius. These taking hold on some inaccurate expressions that appeared in copies of the Oriental manuscripts, turned them to their own advantage, rendered them into the vernacular, and scattered translations broadcast through the country.

The time, however, had now come when the originals of these Oriental liturgies were to be got possession of, examined, approved, and translated. Accordingly, scholars set diligently to work; persons travelling into the eastern countries noted carefully every item of ritual and liturgy; and linguists devoted their lives to elucidating them. Among those who made strenuous and successful efforts to obtain the liturgies of the east, and to collate, and thereby correct them, was Eusebius Renaudot, of Paris; and his work, published in the year 1716, is a mine of information on these matters. The King of France lent his aid, and a large number of manuscripts relating to eastern liturgy and ritual having been obtained, both by public and by private effort, Renaudot, taking for help John Baptist Colbert—“illustriissimus vir,” as he himself calls him—devoted himself to the vast undertaking of examining, and, if possible, of elucidating them.

“Ea demum occasione [he writes] coepi ante multos annos

<sup>1</sup> *Lit. Orient. Collectio*, pref., vol. i.

Liturgiis cognoscendis incumbere, cumque cura amplissimi Joannis B. Colberti, magnus codicum numerus in Bibliothecam regiam delatus esset; multos quoque ipse in suum ex Oriente contulisset; tunc de Orientalium fide et disciplina cognoscenda sperari coeptum est."

Thus by the aid of the King, and that good and wealthy man, *amplissimi viri*, John Colbert, there was gathered into the King's library and into Colbert's own private library a large number of manuscripts, and then "a hope begun to prevail that at length something definite would be known of eastern faith and discipline." Besides the collecting of all together, it was deemed advisable that every document should be reproduced in its native tongue, together with an accompanying translation. Grand in all his thoughts and designs, Bossuet, the great Eagle of Meaux, it was who conceived this project. It was not, however, carried out in its entirety. Renaudot tells why; and, as in doing so, he passed a well-deserved tribute to the great French ecclesiastic and to the great French bibliophile, we quote him once more:—

"Itaque cum novam versionem aggressus fuisssem, eamque commentario explicassem, viris eruditissimis, atque inter ceteros precipuo, nec satis unquam laudato, Jacobo Benigno Bossueto, episcopi meldensi, visum est, illarum Egyptiacarum et reliquarum editionem procurari: quod etiam illustrissimi Joannis Baptistae Colberti judicium fuit. Is autem suamquamque lingua edi volebat, duobus circiter antequam lethaliter decumberet mensibus, typos Syriacos, Hebraicos, et alios parari jusserat; sed summi illius viri [i. e., J. B. Colberti] interitu, concidit operis perticiendi spes, et consilium editionis Liturgiarum Orientalium, suis linguis, abjiciendum fuit."

We have thus briefly seen how—(1) a knowledge of the oriental languages became necessary; how (2) the necessity brought forth the effort; and now, that the copies and originals were in the hands of the Western scholars, we have to see what tale they unfolded of the ritual and liturgy of the Eastern Church, and whether the doctrines and practices of Apostolic times were at one, or were at variance, with the belief and the ceremonies then and now held and practised in the Western Church.



But first we have to glance at a matter mentioned in the beginning of this paper. It was there said, that the liturgies varied even in apostolic days; the words of consecration, however, being always held high above any individual volition or change. This stands in need of some explanation; and it briefly is this. When our Blessed Lord at the Last Supper spoke the sacred words of consecration, and performed the rites closely and essentially connected with that adorable mystery, there was no one to take down in writing—at least, no one there and then did take down in writing—the exact form of ceremonies and words made use of by Him. He said to His disciples: “Do this for a commemoration of Me;” and they did. Each did substantially that very thing which the Lord wished to be done as a commemoration—the sacred words of consecration always remaining untouched and unchanged, and each of the Apostles preceded and followed the august mystery of consecration with the rites and ceremonies that seemed to him most calculated to inspire devotion and awe for the Real Presence of that Lord Whom they had known in the flesh, and “whose glory they had seen as the glory of the only-begotten Son of God.”

This continued during all the apostolic days. With the exception of the sacred words of consecration and the Pater Noster, all the rest was left (so to say) *ad libitum unius-cujusque*. In those early days the episcopus or presbyter, the bishop, or in his absence the most venerable of the clergy, presided. “To him who from among the brethren presides,” says St. Justin Martyr, “is offered bread and a cup of water and wine; and he, having received them, offers up the praise and gratitude of all to the Father through the name of His Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

The ecclesiastic, *qui ex fratribus preest* (who from among the brethren presides), corresponded with our celebrant at High Mass, and offered sacrifice in the name of all. He repeated the prayers from memory, for as yet they were not committed to writing. It may be asked why were not those prayers and ceremonies written out, and thus reduced to an exact and definite liturgy. The answer is to be sought from

the circumstances of the times. It was because of the *Arcani disciplina*. The faithful were afraid to allow any knowledge of their sacred mysteries to fall into the hands of the uninitiated, lest scandal might ensue. This explains the absence of written liturgies, and why in after times there were various ones, because of the enforced secrecy at those times of persecution in the Church.

This accounts also for what at the first sight may seem a puzzle, and not only a puzzle, but even a fraud. We find liturgies called by the name of the Apostles: the liturgy of St. James, the liturgy of St. Mark, and so on. From what has been said, we know that these Apostles wrote no liturgies, delivered none *in scriptis* to their disciples; and how then can these liturgies or rites come to bear their names? Thus; these liturgies were practised by their disciples *verbally*, i.e., from memory, and by the disciples of those disciples verbally or from memory; in the course of time, however, they were committed to writing, and because they were derived, in the first instance from St. Peter, or St. John, or St. James, or St. Mark, they came to be called their liturgies.

For a moment we turn aside to ask, when, and under what circumstances, was the first Mass said by the Apostles. We know that our Lord on Holy Thursday night consecrated for the first time. It is believed that His great representative on the earth, the chief and head of the Apostolic college, was the first after Him "to take bread and break it." This was the phrase that in those days was used to express consecration. It is the tradition that St. Peter did not undertake this sacred work, while yet the Lord remained during forty days on the earth; nor until the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who was to teach them all things, had descended upon them.

The circumstances of piety and preparation and devotion with which St. Peter celebrated first Mass, and the brethren attended thereat, may be rather left to the devout imagination than be described. It is safe to say, that a retired place was found—the Cenacle of Holy Thursday night is pointed out by tradition; and the thought immediately

commends itself. It is the belief, that as the priests of the Old Law wore special vestments, for the sake of solemnity, so it is considered most probable that "the breaking of bread" did not take place in the ordinary, every-day garb of the celebrant. "It is very likely that the apparatus used in the first Mass, and the ceremonies observed thereat, were communicated orally to the Apostles by our Lord Himself, and that they did exactly as he prescribed."<sup>1</sup>

Cardinal Bona says that as the ancient Hebrews used lights in their ceremonies, so, it is likely, that lights were used by the Apostles. He furthermore adduces the fact, that a chasuble of St. Peter's was brought from Antioch to Paris, as a proof that St. Peter celebrated in vestments.

In turning now to those liturgies for a confirmation of our belief in the sacred mystery of the Institution, we have to look at two things—(1) the words used at the solemn moment of Transubstantiation; and (2) the faith which the preceding or subsequent prayers show us that the Apostles and their immediate followers had in the adorable mystery of the Real Presence. The first liturgy, we will refer to for confirmation of these two particulars, is that of *Divi Marci*, one of the four famous liturgies of the Copts.<sup>2</sup> Its full title is *Divina Liturgia, seu missa, Sancti Apostoli et Evangelistae Marci, Discipuli Sancti Petri*.

The people, then, may be considered as gathered together, to assist at the sacred ceremonies; or, in the words of Pliny, "to sing hymns to Christ as their God, to bind themselves by oath not to the commission of any crime, but to the detestation of every crime, and to take food of some innocent kind." Making allowance for the veil of secrecy

<sup>1</sup> O'Brien, *History of the Holy Mass*.

<sup>2</sup> The names Copts and Egyptians are, by linguists, derived from the same root word; in fact, Copts is looked upon as a contraction in the Greek of Egyptians, thus *-Aigup'ioi*, or *Aigoptioi*, *Coptioi*, *Copts*, *Copts*. The three other liturgies in use with the Copts are those of St. Basil, St. Gregory, and St. Cyril. At the present day the liturgies in use all but universally in the East may be reduced to two—that of St. Chrysostom, and that of St. Basil; and the number of languages in which Holy Mass with the approval of the Church is said, is no less than nine. These things may form the subjects of additional papers: it would be entirely too long to discuss them satisfactorily here.

that shaded the sacred mysteries in those days, what a true description, even by a Pagan pen, this is of the religious services of the Christians in Pliny's times.

The liturgy then opens with the priest praying :—

*Priest.*—*Pax omnibus.*

*People.*—*Et spiritui tuo.*

*Deacon.*—*Orate.*

*People.*—*Kyrie eleison (thrice),*

The priest then prays :—

We give thanks to Thee, O Lord our God . . . because Thou didst protect, aid, cherish, and bring us safely through all our past life, and hast kept us unto this hour, and so on.

At the end of the prayer the people say, “Amen.”

*Priest.*—*Pax omnibus.*

*People.*—*Et spiritui tuo.*

*Deacon.*—*Let us pray for the king.*

*People.*—*Kyrie eleison (thrice).*

*Priest.*—O Sovereign Lord and God . . . we pray and beseech of you that you would keep our king in peace and strength and justice . . . and that in the tranquillity of his days we may lead a calm and quiet life in all piety and modesty, and in the grace and mercy and blessings of your only Son . . . &c.

*People.*—*Amen.*

*Priest.*—*Peace to all.*

*People.*—*And to thy spirit.*

*Deacon.*—*Let us pray for the Pope and the Bishop.*

*People.*—*Kyrie eleison (thrice).*

*Priest.*—O Sovereign Lord, Almighty God, Father of our Lord and God and Preserver, Jesus Christ, we pray and beseech You, O bounteous Lover of the human race, that You would preserve our most holy and blessed Pontiff, Pope (N), and our most revered bishop (N). Preserve them to us many years in peace . . . together with all orthodox bishops, priests, deacons, lectors, chanters, and lay people, &c.

In this will be readily discerned the origin of the prayer in the Canon of the Mass to-day—*pro papa nostro (N) et antistite nostro (N)*. The people answer, “Amen.”

*Priest.*—*Peace to all.*

*People.*—*And to thy spirit.*

*Deacon.*—*Stand up for the prayer.*

Then follow the Introit and the prayers of incense. The Introit in this case is a very long prayer. Then follows the



prayer of the *Trisagion*, so called because the prayer ends with these words :—

And we give glory and thanksgiving and *Trisagion* (thrice holy hymn) to Thee, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and for ever, &c.

*People*.—Amen. *Sanctus Deus, Sanctus Fortis, Sanctus Immortalis.*

The Deacon then asks a blessing of the celebrant, just as with us now in High Mass. The priest says : “ May the Lord bless you, and work with you, through His grace, now and for ever.” The Gospel then is read or sung, a prayer is said for the sick and for strangers, and one again for the Catholic world. The deacon then says : “ See that there be no catechumen present.”

The priest then goes to read the *majorem Introitum*. *Sancta ingrediuntur ad altare*, warns the liturgy ; for now the Holy Sacrifice in reality begins, and so the priest solemnly prays :—

O holy, supreme, and tremendous Lord, Who makest Thy abode in Thy saints, do Thou Thyself sanctify us, make us worthy of Thy tremendous priesthood, let us assist at Thine awful altar with an entirely clear conscience, purify our hearts from all defilement, and drive far off from us all reprobate feeling ! Sanctify our heart and soul, and grant that with all fear we may observe the religious ceremonies of our spiritual fathers, every time we propitiate Thy holy countenance ; for it is Thou who sanctifiest and blessest all things, and it is to Thee we offer up glory and thanksgiving.

Fittingly, indeed, does such a prayer open the sacrifice, and we may consider it in its proper place here on the lips of the priest, standing at the altar upon which the Body and Blood of Christ are about to descend.

*Deacon*.—Salutate invicem.

Priest reads the prayer *osculi pacis* :—

Sovereign Lord Almighty, look down from heaven on Thy Church and on all Thy people . . . and grant us Thy peace and Thy charity, and give to us the gift of Thy most Holy Spirit, that we may salute one another with a clean heart and a pure conscience and a holy kiss, and not in wiles or hypocrisy . . . &c.

*Deacon*—Pray for them that offer (*i. e.*, gifts at the offertory) .

The priest reads a prayer corresponding to our Oblation. It will be interesting to priests :—

O Sovereign Lord Jesus Christ, co-equal in sway with the unbegun<sup>ing</sup> Father, and with the Holy Ghost. O great High Priest, Thou the Bread that didst come down from heaven, and didst take our life out of corruption; Thou who didst give Thine own Self, the Immaculate Lamb, for the life of the world, we pray and entreat Thee, O Lord, Lover of men, show Thy face on this bread and on these chalices, which Thy most holy table receives (in the presence of angels ready to minister, and choirs of archangels standing round), through the sacred sacerdotal ministry, for Thy glory and the renewal of our souls, by the grace and mercy and bounty of Thy only-begotten Son, through Whom and by Whom is to Thee glory and empire.

*People.*—And was incarnate of the Holy Ghost.

Then begins the Preface. In all the old liturgies there were, after the withdrawal of the catechumens, four principal things :—(1) The Prayer and Kiss of Peace ; (2) the Preface ; (3) the Consecration ; and (4) the *Pater Noster*. To these four might be added the distribution of Holy Communion and the *Benedictio super populum* at the end.

The Pax held an entirely different place from what it does with us ; and it is hard to say whether it was in a more fitting place with them, when the Mass began, when the catechumens were put out, and no one remained *præter fidelés solos unanimiter orantes*, or with us, when we are about to receive the God of Peace. In either case to the devout mind it has a beautifully mystic meaning.

The Preface in its beginning and in its ending is strikingly like our own, if not identical with it :—

*Sacerdos.*—Dominus vobiscum omnibus.

*Populus.*—Et cum spiritu tuo.

*Sacerdos.*—Sursum nostra corda.

*Populus.*—Habemus ad Dominum.

*Sacerdos.*—Gratias agamus Domino.

*Populus.*—Dignum et Justum.

*Sacerdos.*—Vere quippe dignum est et Justum, &c.

And then follows a long prayer, corresponding to our Preface and Canon, but much longer, and which includes the *Memento* for the living and for the dead. It ends thus :—

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus. Plenum est coelum et terra gloria sancta tua, and so on.

*Populos.*—Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus.

The people in the old liturgies, and the early ages of the Church, joined much more in the words of Holy Mass than they do now, their place being now supplied, partly by the choir, as at High Mass, and the servers; or fully, as at Low Mass, by the servers. Many reasons have conduced to this.

The sacred moment of consecration is now at hand, and let us listen to this old liturgy of *Divi Marci* :—

*Sacerdos mysteria sancta signaculo crucis signat* [as still with us] *dicat* : —Of a truth the heavens and the earth are full of Thy glory, through the manifestation of our Lord and God and Preserver, Jesus Christ; grant, O Lord, that this sacrifice may be also full of Thy benediction, through the coming of Thy most Holy Spirit. Because our Lord and God and High King, Jesus Christ Himself, on the night in which He gave Himself up for our sins, and underwent death in the flesh for all, being seated with His holy Disciples and Apostles, took bread into His holy and immaculate and blameless hands, looking towards heaven to Thee, His Father, our God, and the God of all the world, He gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, broke, and gave to His Apostles and Disciples, saying—[*priest raises his voice*] Take and eat.

Deacon—Extend [your hands].

*Priest.*—*For this is My Body*, which for you is broken and distributed for the remission of sins.

*People.*—Amen.

*Priest.*—And, in like manner, taking the chalice after He had supped, *miscensque vino et aqua*, looking to heaven to Thee, His Father, our God, and the God of all the world, He gave thanks, blessed, and sanctified, filling with the Holy Ghost, and gave to His holy and blessed disciples, saying—(*elata voce*)—*Bibite ex eo omnes*.

Deacon.—Again pray with all attention (*denuo impensius orate*).

*Priest.*—*For this is My Blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, and is distributed for the remission of sins.

*People.*—Amen.

*Priest.*—This do in commemoration of Me; for as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall announce My death, and confess My resurrection and ascension until I come . . . and so on.

Let us, for a moment, introduce St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, one of the eastern bishops in those early days, to testify what this sacred rite meant. He speaks thus :—

“For you have heard just now Paul crying out, that in the night in which the Lord Jesus Christ was betrayed, taking bread

and giving thanks, He broke it, and gave it to His disciples, saying: *Take and eat: this is My Body.* And taking the chalice, and giving thanks, he said: *Take and drink: this is My Blood.* When, therefore, He hath pronounced it of the bread, and said, *This is My Body*, will any one dare thenceforward to quibble? And when He, the same, shall have asserted so strongly, *This is My Blood*, will anyone ever give way to doubt as to say, *it is not His Blood*?

After the Consecration, this liturgy has a series of beautiful prayers, and among the rest the Pater Noster. After the Pater Noster:—

*Priest.*—Peace to all.

*Deacon.*—Incline your heads to Jesus Christ.

*Priest.*—O Sovereign Lord God Almighty, Who sitteth above the cherubim, and art glorified by the seraphim . . . we have inclined to Thee the necks of our souls and our bodies . . . and we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst rejoice our mind with the divine splendours of Thy Holy Spirit; that, filled with the thought of Thee, *we may worthily participate in the good things offered to us by the immortal Body and precious Blood of Thy only Son.*

Their belief cannot be far removed from ours. At any rate, that is very like the prayer that would fall from a Catholic priest about to administer Holy Communion at the present day.

*Priest.*—Peace to all.

*Deacon.*—With the fear of God.

The priest reads a prayer, begging God to accept from his lips, although a sinner, while God is *Sanctus*, the immortal hymn of the cherubim.

*People.*—Kyrie Eleison (*thrice*).

*Priest.*—Sancta Sanctis (holy things for the holy).

The priest then proceeds to administer Holy Communion first to himself, and while doing so the hymn or psalm, (*Quoniam laudum corpus est*: As the hart panteth for the water-brooks") is sung by the people. And when he gives Communion to the clerics, the priest says, "*Corpus Sanctum.*" And at the chalice he says, "*Sanguis Preciosus Domini, et Dei, et Salvatoris nostri.*" It is not possible for a Catholic priest, believing, as he does, in the Real Presence, to use words more direct, more assertive, or more declaratory than these.



Let us hear St. Cyril of Jerusalem, once again giving evidence :—

“ The very doctrine of the blessed Paul is abundantly sufficient to make us know for certain all about these divine mysteries, made worthy of which you become *concorporei ut ita dicam* (one and the same body, if I might so say), *et consanguinei*, and (one and the same blood) with Christ the Lord.”

And to put this beyond doubt, the priest, according to the liturgy, goes on to read a prayer of thanksgiving thus :—

We give Thee thanks, O our supreme Lord and God, for the partaking of these holy, undefiled, immortal, and heavenly mysteries, which Thou hast given to us for the benefit, sanctification, and safety of our souls and bodies. Truly we beseech Thee, O good Lord and lover of the human race to grant that *this communion of the Sacred Body and Precious Blood of Thy only begotten Son* may be to us faith unbounded, charity unfeigned, abundance of piety, aversion for everything contrary to Thee, observance of Thy Commandments, viaticum of life eternal, and acceptable defence before the dread tribunal of Thy Christ.

And then this liturgy (so called) of the *Divi Marci* winds up, like our Mass to-day, with the *Ite in Pace* of the deacon, and the *Benedictio* of the priest.

R. O'KENNEDY.

## CHRISTIANITY IN NORTH AMERICA BEFORE THE COMING OF COLUMBUS.<sup>1</sup>

THAT America was known to Europeans prior to its discovery by Christopher Columbus, is a thing now generally admitted; but that Christianity was propagated in the New World before Columbus's time is a question requiring clear and distinct proofs for a like definite settlement. The extremely ancient Egyptian tradition—that

<sup>1</sup> The substance of a paper read before the *Congrès Scientifique Internationale des Catholiques*, held at Paris, April, 1891, by the Rev. Dr. Luker Jelic, of Spalato (Dalmatia). Dr. Jelic's numerous notes, references, and appendices have been here omitted, with the exception of a hitherto unedited Papal Bull; whilst some extracts referring to the subject have been supplied from such authorities as M. de Quatrefages, Dr. Rink, and Nansen, the latest explorer of Greenland, by the translator.

pointed to by Plato in his writings—as to the existence of an immense continent beyond the Atlantic Ocean was maintained right along through the Middle Ages, and received no inconsiderable confirmation from the story of the voyage made by St. Brendan and his companion-monks in the sixth century of our era, in quest of this mythical Trans-Atlantic world: of their finding it, and sojourning there for some years: and then returning finally to their own country. The failure, even of all subsequent efforts, to re-discover the Trans-Atlantic isles visited by these Irish monks did not cause the recollection of their discovery to die out, as the writings of the cosmographers—Honoré d'Autun (1112-1137), Gervais de Tilbury (1216), and the cosmographical maps of the Middle Ages, bear witness.

Yet from all this can only be gathered a kind of hazy idea as to a world existing beyond the Atlantic, blended with which is a legendary element, borrowed from the myths of antiquity. We have at hand, however, other sources of information, which not only prove that the American Continent was known, but that it was even colonized by people from Northern Europe from the beginning of the tenth century. The Scandinavian *Sagas*, or popular tales, form a collection of historical evidence of some value; and from these we learn that Greenland had become known to certain Norse adventurers during the last quarter of the ninth century, and was colonized by their countrymen towards the close of the tenth century; whilst the adjoining countries—Helluland, Markland, Vinland, and Hvitramniannaland—already known by the end of the tenth, were visited and colonized in the eleventh century. After the conversion of these lands to Christianity at the beginning of the eleventh century, religion seems to have kept pace with the growth and spread of civilization, proofs of whose existence are evidenced in the numerous ruins discovered by modern explorers, whose discoveries furthermore confirm *en bloc* the story of the *Sagas*.

Besides these latter, there are other historical documents bearing on this question; yet what hitherto was wanted was such evidence in detail as would clearly show all that was to

be known concerning the introduction and duration of Catholicity in pre-Columbian America, a matter that certain non-Catholic writers not merely threw doubt on, but went so far as to deny that the faith had gained any foothold there. It has been our good fortune to discover, in the archives of the Vatican, documents of such a kind as will, to some extent at least, supply this want. Instead, however, of giving the religious history of all the American lands that were known and evangelized by Europeans before Columbus's famous discovery, we shall confine ourselves for the present to the diocese of *Gardar*, which embraced within its limits Greenland and the adjoining north-east coast of North America.

The Icelandic *Sagas* attribute the discovery and colonization of Greenland to the Norse adventurers, Gunnbjorn, A.D. 887, and Eric the Red, 893; and the discovery and colonization of the coasts of North America to Bjarn Heriolfson (in 986), and Lief the Fortunate (the son of Eric), in A.D. 1001. The conversion of Greenland to Christianity was, according to the *Sagas*, the work of St. Olave, surnamed the Great, the second Norwegian king of that name (1015-1030), to whom also belongs the honour of having consolidated the Christian faith in Norway. The story of the *Sagas* is confirmed by the Bull of Pope Nicholas V., dated 1448, till now unedited (given as an appendix to this paper); in which the Pope, in reply to the statements laid before him by the Greenlanders, speaks of a "still living tradition amongst the natives and settlers of Greenland," according to which Greenland had been converted to Christianity about six centuries previous, by preachers sent thither by King Olaf, ever since which it had remained faithful to the Catholic religion, and subject to the Apostolic See.

The date of the introduction of Christianity into the Continent of America cannot be so easily fixed as that of the preaching of the Gospel in Greenland, since we have only a few vague indications on that head. In 1050 the Saxon bishop, Jonus, repaired to Vinland, in order to evangelize the natives there, who had already entered into such

close relations with the Norse settlers as to intermarry with them. His efforts won him the crown of martyrdom ; but of the subsequent attempts made in this direction we have no definite account until the days when Eric-Upsi, *an Irishman*, who was consecrated regionary bishop of these American lands in 1112-13, ultimately succeeded in bringing the light of the Gospel to the natives of the American Continent. In 1121 he proceeded to Vinland, having left Greenland for ever, in order to devote himself exclusively to the evangelization of this new country. That his apostolate produced abundant fruits there, is shown, first, by ancient Mexican manuscripts ; secondly, by the narrative written by the Venetian, Antonio Zeno, at the close of the fourteenth century, in which it is stated that one of his companions lived for several years amongst the natives of Vinland, and had found, in their king's library, *Latin books, which the natives no longer understood* ; and, thirdly, by the fact that in the documents relating to the collection of the revenues of the Apostolic Chamber, in the thirteenth and following centuries, products of Vinland appear, amongst other matters, connected with the diocese of Gardar. But a stronger proof still of the happy effects of Eric-Upsi's apostolate is afforded us in the narrative of Christian LeClerq, for fourteen years a missionary, in the seventeenth century, in Gaspesia (now known as Acadia and Nova Scotia) ; wherein he speaks of having found amongst the natives savages called *Porte Croix* (Cross-bearers), possessing traditions of a biblical character ; and a prayer, seemingly an echo of the *Pater Noster*, with whom the cross was their most venerated object of worship, whether at their meetings or on their tombs, their clothing, or their goods ; and the sign of their superiority over the other nations. To account for the curious religious condition in which he found these savages, this missionary gave it as his opinion that they had at some former period been instructed in the Christian religion, but that in the course of time, through want of priests, they had fallen back into ignorance and idolatry, being unable, through lack of adequate religious instruction, to preserve their faith intact.



As to the Greenland colonies, they were attached to the ecclesiastical province of Hamburg-Bremen during the first century succeeding their conversion, by the direction of Pope Benedict IX. (1044), in which province were included all the countries in the North of Europe; and they were confided to the pastoral care of the neighbouring bishops of Iceland. After the first regionary bishop of these American lands, Eric-Upsi, had decided on remaining in Vinland, and given up all thoughts of going back to Greenland, the colonists held a diet, in 1123, when, at the proposal of Sokke Thorerssohn, they formulated a desire that an episcopal see should be established in Greenland, notwithstanding the fact that the country had not the requisite number of inhabitants to form a diocese; yet, on account of its great distance, and the difficulties of communication between it and Europe, the prayer of the Diet was granted; and their first bishop, Arnold, elected in 1124, and consecrated by the Archbishop of Lund, fixed his see, in 1126, at Gardar, which thus became the capital of the entire region. The new diocese continued a suffragan of the province of Hamburg-Bremen down to the middle of the twelfth century. On the organization of the ecclesiastical province of Norway, the diocese of Gardar was attached to that province. In 1148 Pope Eugenius III. sent off Cardinal Nicholas Breakspere, Bishop of Albano (afterwards Pope Adrian IV.) as *Legate a latere*, to establish a regular hierarchy in the kingdoms of Sweden and Norway. Amongst other matters, the Legate proceeded to organize the province of Drontheim (Nidrosin, Trundum), making the latter the metropolitan of eight subject sees, included amongst which was Gardar. Cardinal Breakspere's arrangement was confirmed by Pope Anastasius IV. (who succeeded Eugenius III.) in a bull dated November 30, 1154, the text of which is inserted in that of Innocent III., issued in 1206. In fact, from the middle of the twelfth century down the diocese of Gardar is always mentioned as suffragan to the metropolitan Church of Drontheim in the *Census Books* of the Holy See, as also in the *Provinciale Vetus* of Albinus, which was compiled from earlier sources in 1183; in the *Liber Censusum* of Cencius

Cameranus, in the year 1192: and, later on, in the *Libri Fanarum*, drawn up from the *Liber Censuum*.

The solicitude of the Sovereign Pontiffs for the delivery of the Holy Land from the Saracen yoke was the cause of there being at hand a larger number of documents relating to the diocese of Gardar from the second half of the thirteenth century down than for the preceding period. At that time a crusade was preached and tithes collected in aid of the Holy Land, even from the furthestmost parts of the known world, including the Arctic regions. So early as 1261, a Norwegian bishop, named Olaf, made a voyage out to these distant parts for that purpose, and succeeded in inducing the Greenlanders, who till then had possessed a republican form of government, to place themselves under the rule of Hakin Hakinson, the reigning King of Norway, and likewise to contribute both men and money to the proposed expedition for the rescue of the Holy Places; and during the succeeding years the faithful of the diocese of Gardar continued to pay the tithes, which were still collected for that object. Amongst the different pontifical bulls addressed to the Collectors of Receipts in the Apostolic Chamber in the kingdom of Norway, there are some which supply information, to a greater or lesser extent, in regard to the diocese of Gardara. They show us, for instance, that the Archbishop of Drontheim and the Bishop of Bergen were on various occasions charged personally with the collection of the tithes in the Gardar diocese: and also that this diocese not only included Greenland, but likewise the known lands of the American continent, which will give an idea of its immense extent. It was precisely on this latter account that in 1276 the Archbishop of Drontheim begged of Pope John XXI. to be dispensed from the obligation of proceeding in person to the diocese of Gardar in order to collect the Papal cess and tithes, as it would take him over four years, he considered, to accomplish this mission. Now, according to another bull of the same year, we learn that it took six years to visit the other dioceses of the same province, which included the whole of the kingdom of Norway; whence it follows that the diocese

of Gardar was in itself almost as extensive as the entire Norwegian kingdom. For this reason, consequently, Pope Nicholas III. accorded, in 1279, extraordinary powers to the clergyman appointed as his delegate by the Archbishop of Drontheim for the collection of tithes in the diocese of Gardar.

From a bull of Pope Martin IV., dated 1282, we find that the tithes and cess of this diocese were paid "in kind," *i.e.*, in the natural products of the country; viz., in ox-hides, sealskin, and whalebone, which were carried over to Norway, and there turned into money. Now, as we know, there are no oxen in Greenland, and the people there must have paid their tithes with the products of their fisheries. Ox-hides, therefore, collected by the agents of the Apostolic Chamber, must have been contributed by the faithful of another part of the diocese, that is to say, Vinland and the adjoining countries; and, in fact, amongst the tithes for the year 1307 we find the products of Vinland actually enumerated.

After the Council of Vienne, in 1311, when the amount was made known which the bishops and clergy of Gardar were to contribute as sexennial tithes, Arnilla, the then bishop, proceeded to his residence there in 1315, in order to organize it. In the month of August, 1326, Pope John XXII. sent to Sweden and Norway two nuncios, viz., Jean de Serin, Prior of the Dominicans at Figeac, and Bernard d'Orteuil, Cure of Novaum, to collect this tithe. A complete account of this mission is to be found among the Vatican archives in the manuscript volumes, *Rationes Collectionae Sveciæ, Norvegiæ, Gotiæ et Angliæ*, 1316-1326, 227, in which are shown the amounts collected in each diocese, both as tithes and Peter's Pence, their conversion into florins, the rates of exchange with the different bankers, the expenses of the journey; and, finally, the precise sum presented by the two nuncios on their return to Rome, A.D. 1329.

From this return we learn that the nuncio Bernard d'Orteuil received from the Archbishop of Drontheim, on the 11th of August, 1327, the sexennial tithes of the diocese of Gardar on behalf of the Holy Land, which were paid in

walrus teeth, weighing 127 Norwegian lispons, which he sold to a Flemish merchant, Jean d'Ypres, for twelve pounds fourteen shillings, Tours money, half of which was given to the king, by virtue of an indult of Pope John XXII., and the other half exchanged into gold florins, and forwarded to the Apostolic Chamber. In the collectors' final account this sum figures in gold florins amongst the tithes received from the other dioceses. On the same day the nuncio received, as the annual Peter's Pence collection from the diocese of Gardar, walrus teeth of the value of six *sols*, in Tours money. By turning these sums into current Norwegian money, according to which was fixed the amount to be thus raised, we find that the diocese of Gardar paid 338 marks as the sexennial tithe money, or at the rate of 56½ marks per year, and six marks as its annual Peter's Pence offering. Now the sexennial tithe having been imposed on the clergy, at the rate of one-tenth of the revenues of their benefices, it follows that they were fairly rich, and numerous likewise. In fact, on comparing the tithe-levy of the diocese of Gardar with that of the rest of the province, it will be seen that it forms one forty-ninth of the whole. From these data we can arrive at some conclusion as to the population of this diocese, which probably numbered about ten thousand souls. Besides these items, which furnish us with an approximate idea of the statistics of the Gardar diocese in the fourteenth century, the collectors' report mentions the interesting fact of a cup, made of some foreign sort of nut, with a silver stand to it, and with two golden florins, having been left as a legacy for the benefit of the Holy Land.

During the succeeding years the religious affairs of the Gardar diocese seem to have gone on prosperously. In 1418 it paid, as tithes and Peter's Pence, more than 2,600 lbs. of teeth, more than double of what it had done in 1327. This would show that the number of the clergy and faithful had increased considerably; and from what we can further gather respecting this period, Greenland alone then possessed a cathedral, twelve parish churches, and a Dominican monastery, the remains of which have been discovered by modern travellers. In 1418 Greenland was unhappily invaded



by a horde of barbarians from the American Continent, who landed on the coast, pillaged and burned all the inhabited places, and carried the people into slavery. Nine only of the churches escaped destruction, through being situated in the interior, and favoured, as it were, by the rigour of the climate.

Thirty years afterwards the Greenlanders made their escape from captivity, and got back to their own country, where they rebuilt as well as they were able, some of the churches that had stood on the sea-shore; and they next besought Pope Nicholas V. to restore Christian worship amongst them, by sending them a bishop and priests, of whom they sadly stood in need, owing to their former pastors having been massacred by the barbarians at the time of the invasion, or else compelled to seek their safety in flight. In the request which the Greenlanders presented to the Pope on this occasion, they narrated in touching terms the tale of the catastrophe of which they had been the victims, and the sufferings which they had to undergo during their thirty years' captivity on the mainland to the south of Greenland. The Pope lent a willing ear to the prayer of the Greenlanders, and, in 1448, charged the Bishops of Hóla and Skalholt with the restoration of religion in Greenland; but, from some cause or other, which has never yet been explained, this commission came to naught. Half a century later on, the Greenlanders renewed their request, this time to Pope Innocent VIII. Their condition now was one truly worthy of commiseration. Left entirely to themselves for nearly a century, without priest or bishop to instruct them, many of them had lapsed into ignorance and forgetfulness of the faith of their forefathers, the only reminder of which amongst them was a "corporal," which was exposed to public veneration once a-year, being that on which, nigh a century before, the last Greenland priest had consecrated the Body of the Lord. Moved by this touching appeal Pope Alexander VI., who had just succeeded to Innocent VIII., in 1492, sent to the see of Gardar a Benedictine monk, named Mathias, who had already been raised to the episcopate by his predecessor. "He was a man filled

with a holy ardour for the salvation of the poor Greenlanders; and ready to risk his life, if needs be, in order to relieve his diocese." This occurred precisely at the time when all Europe was ringing with the news of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

[APPENDIX.—BULL OF POPE NICHOLAS V.

1448. SEPTEMBRIS 22, PAPA NICHOLAUS V. MANDAT GOTSVINNO EPISCOPO SKALHOTENSI ET GOTTSCHALKO EPISCOPO HOLENSI, UT INQUISITO STATU DIOCESES GARDARENSIS, DE CONSIDIO ETIAM SUI METROPOLITANI, HIERARCHIAM ECCLESIASTICAM IN EADEM AUCTORITATE APOSTOLICA RESTITUANT.<sup>1</sup>

Nicolaus, etc., Venerabilis fratribus [Gotsvinno] Schalotensi et [Gottschalko] Olensi Episcopis, salutem, &c. In iniuncto, nobis desuper apostolice servitutis officio universarum ecclesiarum regimini presidentes, sic auctore domino pro animarum salute precioso Salvatoris redemptus commercio nostre sollicitudinis curam impendimus, ut illas non solum impietatis et errorum procellis sepius fluctuantes, sed et erumis et persecutionum turbinibus involutas ad statum optime tranquillitates reducere studeramus. Sane pro parte dilectorum filiorum indigenarum et universitatis habitatorum insule Grenolandie, que in ultimis finibus oceanum ad septentrionalem plagam Regni Norvegiae in provincia Nidrorensi dicitur situata, lacrimabilis querela nostrum turbavit auditum, amariaripet mentem, quod in ipsam Insulam cuius habitatores et incolae ab annis fere sanctis Christo fidem gloriosi sui preconis Beati Olavi Regis predicatione susceptam, primam et intemeratam sub sancte Romane ecclesie et sedis apostolice pietatis servavit: ac quod tempore succedente in dicta insula populis assidua devotione flagrantibus, sanctorum edes quam plurime et insignis ecclesia Cathedralis erecte fuerant, in quibus divinus cultus sedulo agebatur donec, illo permittente, qui imperscrutabili sapientie et scientie sue scrutino persepe, quos diligit, temporaliter corrigit, et ad meliorem emendam, castigat, ex finitimis licetoribus paganorum ante annos triginta classe navali barbari insurgentes, cunctam habitatorum ibidem populum crudeli invasioni aggressi et ipsam urbem edesque sacras, igne et gladio devastantes solis [in insula novem relictis ecclesiis parochialibus, que latissimis dicitur extendi terminis, quas propter crepidines montium commode adire non poterant, miserandos utriusque sexus indigenas, illos precipue quos ad subeundum perpetuo onera servitutis aptos videbant et fortes tamquam ipsorum tyrannidi accommodatos, ad propria venerunt captivos. Verum quia, sicut eadem querela subiegebatur, post temporis successum quamplurimi ex captivitate predicta redeuntis ad propria et relictis, hinc

<sup>1</sup> Arch. Vat., Reg. 407, fr. 251.

inde locorum ruinis, divinum cultum possitenuis ad instar dispositionis pristine ampliare et instaurare desiderent; et quia propter preteritarum calamitatum pressuras fame et inedia laborantibus non suppetebat hucusque facultus presbyteros nutriendi et presulen, toto illo triginta annorum tempore Episcopi solatio et sacerdotum ministerio cariserunt, nisi quis per longissimam dierum et locorum distanciam divinorum desiderio officiorum ad illas se conferre voluisset ecclesias, quas manus barbarica illesas pretermisit, nobis humiliter supplicari fecerunt quatenus eorum pro et salutaro pro posito paterna miseratino [s] uccurere et ipsorum in spiritualibus supplere defectus nostrumque et apostolico sedis in premissis favorem impeteri benivolum digneremur. Nos igitur dictorum indigenarum et universitates habitatorum prefati insule Grenolandii instis et honestas precibus et desiderii inclinatio, de premissis et eorum circumstantiis certum noticiam non habentes paternitati vestre, quos ex vicinioribus Episcopis insule prefate esse intelleximus, per apostolica scripta committimus et mandamus, quatenus vos vel alter vestrum diligente examine audites et intellectis premisses, si ea veritate fulcire compereritis ipsumque populum et indigenos munero et facultatibus adeo sufficienter esse resumptos quod id pro nunc expedire videbitis quod ipsi affectare videntur, de sacerdotibus ydoneis et exemplari vita preditis ordinandi et providendi plebanos et rectores instituendi; qui parrochias et ecclesias resarcitas gubernent, sacramenta ministrent et so vobis sivi alteri vestrum demum expedire videbitur et opportunitatem, requisito ad hoc Metropolitanis consilio, si loci distancia patretur, personam utilem et ydoneam nostram et sedis apostolice communionem habentem, eis in Episcopum ordinare et instituere ac sibi munus consecrationis in forma ecclesie consueta nomine nostro impendere et administracionem spiritualium et temporalium concedere, recepto ab eodem prius iuramento nobis et Romane ecclesie debito et consueto valeatis vel alter vestrum valeat; super quibus omnibus vestram conscienciam oneramus, plenam et liberam vobis vel alteri vestrum auctoritate apostolica concedimus tenore presentium facultatem, statutes et constitutionibus apostolicis et generalium conciliorum ac alio in contrarium editis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Rome apud Sanctam Potenciamur Anno, etc., millesimo quadrigentissimo quadagesimo octavo, duodecimo Kalendas Octavis, Pontificatus nostri anno secundo.

NORSE RUINS AND REMAINS IN GREENLAND AND AMERICA. FINAL FATE OF THE EARLY NORSE SETTLERS.

M. de Quatrefages<sup>1</sup> was of opinion that the tomb discovered in the last century, in Rainsford Island (near to Hull and Api-

<sup>1</sup> Vide, *The Human Species*: Kegan Paul & Co.

Alderton), built of solid masonry, containing a skeleton, and a sword with an iron hilt, indicating a period anterior to the fifteenth century, might have been that of Thorwald, brother of Leif, the discoverer of Vinland, Rhode Island; and he ascribes the famous *Dragon Heeling Rock*, situated on the right bank of the Taumton River, to Thorfinn (whose son Snorro was the first Scandinavian born in Vinland), who marked it thus as a memento of his stay in that country, when he quitted it as no longer safe to live in, owing to the attacks of a people called the Skrellings. Dr. Rink<sup>1</sup> identifies the present Eskimo station called Igaliko, with Brattelid, the ancient residence of Eric the Red, where the ruins of about seventeen buildings have been found, one bearing evidence of having been the house in which Eric took up his first abode, the stones of which are of an astonishing size. One of the other ruins appears to have been a church, and fragments of ruinic stones, indicating Christian sepulchres, have been found around. Opposite the Moravian station of Fredericksdal are also some remarkable ruins. One appears to have been the churchyard of the old Christian Norsemen. Wooden coffins have been found with skeletons; and entire shrouds made of coarse hairy cloth. In some of them were wooden crosses, which had, apparently, been enclosed in the folded bands of the dead; and in one of these the name of Maud was carved in runics. A Christian tombstone, with a runic inscription, has also been found here. The remains of the Church of Gardar, whose first bishop, Arnold, took up his abode here, in 1126, and of the adjoining monastery have been pointed out, with great probability, on the shore of Einar's Ford, opposite the ruins of Brattelid, above mentioned. About twelve miles from the southernmost of the present chief station stands the most remarkable of the Norse ruins, the Kakortok Church, which was constructed of large stones, bearing slight traces of having been hewn, but most skilfully adapted to one another. The church, has three separate entrances, the principal one of which is covered with a flat stone twelve feet in length. In the eastern wall opposite is a skilfully-arched window, likewise built from rough stones. In the vicinity of the church several other ruins of houses or fences are found.

In a topographical description of Greenland, supposed to date from the fourteenth century, called "The Description by Ivan Bardson," who officiated as manager at the bishop's see at Gardar, we read: "Item: Next to Ketil'sfjord is Rafn'sfjord, and far into it is the sister monastery Ordinis St. Benedicti. This monastery owns the whole to its termination; and, towards the outside, to the Vaage Church, which is consecrated to St. Olaf. The Vaage possessed the whole country outside the fjord. In

<sup>1</sup> *Danish Greenland.*



the fjord are many islands, which are the joint property of the monastery and the cathedral church. Upon these islands there is much warm water, which in winter is so hot that no one can approach it, but in summer so moderately hot as to allow of people bathing in it; and many persons recover their health there after sickness. Item: The next one is Pinarsfjord, near which stands a costly church, dedicated to St. Nicholas, which the king has to enfeoff." If we now survey our present maps, near Lechtenanfjord are many islands, and by its Swralik traces the remains of a church and cemetery have been found. From Amituarsuk is a route to the supposed remains of the bishop's residence at the Igalikofjord. Around the outer bay ruins have been found in eight or ten places, while the springs exist upon one of the islands, in the centre of it. It will be apparent that these facts agree in a remarkable manner with the fragment of the description here quoted.

Nearly all the Norse groups of ruins, about a hundred of which places have been found scattered along the coast of Greenland, are very low, and partly overgrown with creeping juniper and willow. Only *one* Scandinavian ruin, however, has been all—according to Nansen<sup>1</sup>—that has been found on its east coast, where it was discovered, in 1881, by the Moravian missionary Broadbeck, at Norsak, north of Lundenon's Fjord, in lat. 60° 30' North. Referring to the disappearance of the Norse settlers from Greenland, Dr. Rink writes: "The last trace of early communication between Scandinavia and the American Continent is found in the year 1347, when a ship arrived at Norway which had also visited Markland. When, subsequent to 1349, the plague, or 'black-death,' broke out in Norway, the far-off colony was still more neglected. In 1379, or 1349, the Western colony was attacked and destroyed by the Eskimo; and from that time the Norse settlers were confined to the southernmost part of Greenland." A remarkable document, preserved from the year 1409, contains the wedding contract of a young Iclander, who was married on a visit to Greenland. This marriage settlement was drawn up at Garde (Gardar), and signed by the *officialis*, or vicar of the bishop. In all likelihood none of the bishops appointed to Greenland after that time ever set foot in the country; the last one died in Denmark about the year 1540.

Between the years 1400 and 1448 some communication, at long intervals, still seems to have existed; but in the last half of the fifteenth century it is known for certain to have completely ceased, and henceforth the sailing route to Greenland actually passed into oblivion. When the country had been rediscovered by John Davis, in 1583, and the whole coast afterwards thoroughly searched, no others than the present Eskimo people

<sup>1</sup> *Across Greenland*, 1890.

were found there, who have only preserved two or three traditional tales about the ancient Europeans in Greenland. Both Dr. Rink and Nansen incline to the belief that the last of the Norse settlers were gradually absorbed into the Eskimo population. M. de Quatrefages, though he makes mention of a white population, tall and fair-haired, which Captain Graa met with on the coast of Greenland, during his expedition in search of the Norse settlement of Osterbygd, thinks, however, that the greater number of the Norse survivors must have emigrated, and sought refuge in Vinland, of the existence of which they were aware. The history of the Scandinavian voyages, he adds, is sufficient to explain the appearance of the white type, even the fair type, in the midst of American populations; and he does not hesitate to pronounce of Aryan stock the white Esquimaux of Charleroi, the fair-haired men of Pierre Martyr, the fair men spoken of in some Mexican traditions, the white savage chief whom the Spaniards met with in the Arbola expedition, &c. He speaks also of Bishop Eric-Upsi, the Irishman, having eighteen episcopal successors; and that Queen Margaret, sovereign of the Scandinavian dominions, impelled by motives which have been differently interpreted, had interdicted all commerce with the Norse colonies in Greenland. Greenland and Iceland, singular to say, are now almost the only known regions in which no modern Catholic missionary has as yet set foot.]

JAMES COLEMAN, M.R.S.A.I.

---

## WILLIAM GEORGE WARD AND THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL.<sup>1</sup>

FIVE years have elapsed since the publication by Mr. Wilfrid Ward of an account of the earlier portion of his father's life; and those familiar with the history of "*William George Ward and the Tractarian Movement*" will, we do not doubt, be much gratified at having an opportunity of following Mr. Ward through the Catholic period of his life, and of hearing what he did, and how he fared, when at length he became a member of the Church which he had loved so dearly, and with which he had been in such close sympathy, even in his Anglican days.

<sup>1</sup>By Wilfrid Ward. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

In the book before us, Mr. Wilfred Ward continues his filial task ; and, with the same literary skill and ability, and the same thorough familiarity with the theological and philosophical questions which were so conspicuous in the earlier volume, continues his account of his father's life, from the time of his reception into the Catholic Church, in 1845, to his death, in 1882. To our own readers, the second volume will probably be of even greater interest than the first ; for, not only have the lives of the Tractarian leaders been almost too frequently placed before the reading world during these later years, with full and copious accounts of all that was said and thought, projected and accomplished, concerning the Oxford Movement during the second quarter of the present century, but also, from the nature of the case, Catholics must take a deeper interest in the purely Catholic and philosophical questions, the discussion of which constitutes the main portion of the present volume, than they could possibly feel in the history of a phase of thought in the Protestant Establishment.

As mentioned above, we left Mr. Ward, in 1845, at the moment of his becoming a Catholic, and when he was enjoying the first-fruits of the peace and rest which followed his reception into the Church. Few converts, in some ways, can have suffered less than he did, in his severance with the past. His wife, the only member of his family for whom he felt great affection, was fully at one with him in making the change, and became a Catholic at the same time ; whilst the friends to whom he was most deeply attached, Newman and Faber and Oakeley, were either already within the fold or shortly followed him thither. Moreover, he can have felt but little of the strangeness, either in Catholic devotions or in Catholic customs, which is said to be a trial to some converts. He was already familiar with the Church's Breviary, which he had been in the habit of using ; he loved the Mass in his Anglican days, much as a naughty child will love the forbidden fruit ; and, indeed, for years past he had almost defiantly exalted all things Roman at the expense of all things Anglican. In fact, he must have felt more like a wanderer returning to his true home than as a stranger

entering an unknown country, when at length admitted into the Church which his intellect had long recognised as the only true one, and in which alone his affections were fully satisfied. We do not forget, on the other hand, that great temporal losses followed on Ward's conversion; and, though few men were more indifferent to mere worldly considerations, yet, when he found himself, as we are told, that on one occasion he did, confronted with a whole quarter of a year's expenses, and a single five-pound note to meet them, even Ward must have felt some anxiety for the welfare of his family. His poverty was not, however, destined to last long. On the very occasion when he, with unusual, but very pardonable, depression was cogitating as to how five pounds could be made to do the work of fifty, a gentleman was seen approaching, who explained that he paid Ward a visit in the hopes of being able to induce him to undertake the charge of his son, and to impart to the youth some of the culture not usually to be acquired in those days outside an English university, and offering him £300 a-year as his emolument. For the moment, this proposal must have relieved Ward's mind, and not long afterwards his uncle, whose heir he was, died, and he inherited a valuable property in the Isle of Wight. Ward's frankness in owning that he was unable to repress a wish during his uncle's last illness that it might have a speedy and fatal ending, an event by which he would so greatly profit, is characteristic. He probably exaggerated the feeling, as he did any and every other which told against himself; but, at any rate, it was sufficiently strong to cause him a scruple of conscience, and he consulted a priest in the neighbourhood as to how far the impressible feeling was faulty.

“The priest suggested the customary considerations. ‘It is quite enough that you should feel a certain regret at the prospect of your uncle's *death*,’ he said, ‘though you may be pleased to inherit his property.’ But Mr. Ward's candour was not to be beaten. ‘I feel no regret whatever at the prospect!’ he insisted. ‘Well, you must have a certain wish, quite apart from other consequences, that he might be spared.’ ‘No, not the slightest! I never cared for him in the least!’ ‘Your poor uncle has been suffering—your spirits fall a little, at all events, when you hear



he is worse?' 'On the contrary, they rise.' The priest began to fear he was dealing with a reprobate. 'Good heavens!' he said suddenly, 'you would not do anything to *hasten* his death, would you?' The roar of laughter with which his penitent received the question was sufficient answer."

Nature, however, never intended W. G. Ward to be a mere country squire, and although we must rejoice that for the future he should be spared all anxiety touching money matters, we cannot but think that wealth would have been more welcome had it come to him in any other form rather than in the possession of broad acres. He cared for none of the pleasures of country life: he hardly knew a cow from a horse, or a partridge from a hen. Even such wide differences as those between an elm tree and a beech he looked on as points in the "minutiæ of botany" which it required a special scientific training to master. He cared for no sport or recreation which rightly belonged to his position; but he had a strong sense of the duties which it was incumbent on him to perform; and although these were little to his taste, and on most of them he was profoundly ignorant, he yet conscientiously endeavoured to do his best for his tenants. The bad landlords of Irish history, or those who whilst enjoying the privileges of property ignored and were indifferent to its duties, had long been to Ward objects of just detestation; and as he had blamed his uncle for neglecting his people, he was bound to do his duty by them himself. Ward was not, however, called on at once to relinquish the intellectual and devotional life he was leading at Old Hall where he settled after his conversion. He had acquired in the earlier years of Cardinal Wiseman's episcopate a recognised position in the College of St. Edmund's as lecturer on moral and dogmatic philosophy, and after consultation with Newman and other friends, it was decided that for the present he should continue to reside in a house built for him by Pugin in the grounds of Old Hall, and only visit the Isle of Wight at intervals. This life, thus divided between the two places, lasted until 1858, and was, in his own opinion, the happiest period of his existence. He thoroughly enjoyed preparing and delivering his lectures, which from

the accounts given of them by many of his pupils, must have been of a singularly impressive nature; and whilst the early part of the day was devoted to the serious matter of teaching theology to the rising priesthood of England, the near neighbourhood of Old Hall to London enabled him to enjoy the one recreation which afforded him great pleasure, the theatre, or still better, the Italian Opera. "I give my mornings to things dogmatic," he explained, "my evenings to things dramatic."

Ward was not allowed to hold his position of professor at St. Edmund's without encountering considerable opposition from many excellent men whose opinion he valued. The mere fact of a married layman teaching divinity to ecclesiastical students, was an anomaly which clashed with the traditions of the College; and when the layman was, moreover, a convert from Protestantism, and therefore necessarily new to much that a born Catholic may be said to imbibe with his mother's milk, the opposition was still more pronounced. The Oxford converts, although warmly received at Rome, in England undoubtedly had to face a certain amount of criticism from their co-religionists. Newman himself speaks of "the cruel suspicion that there is heresy at the bottom of us;" and it probably appeared unseemly to the clergy and professors at St. Edmund's, that one whom they considered a mere learner should be placed in the most responsible position in the College. From all we read, however, it is fortunate for England and the present generation of her clergy that the opposition to Ward came to nothing. In consequence of it, he had at one time thought of retiring; but Cardinal Wiseman, who from the first had fully appreciated Ward, begged him so earnestly to remain, that he withdrew his resignation. "I should sincerely deplore your thinking of leaving us," the Cardinal wrote; "indeed, I will say and do everything in my power to avoid such a calamity." At the same time, at Archbishop Wiseman's request, Pío Nono conferred the degree of Doctor in Philosophy on Ward, as a sign of Papal confidence and a signal mark of appreciation which must help to silence his enemies.

As we remarked before, we can gather from the accounts of more than one of Ward's pupils, men who have since been distinguished ecclesiastics of the Church in England, that although his lectures may have differed widely from the ordinary and the supposed orthodox style of lecture, they were most effective not alone in imparting a knowledge of the deep and heart-stirring truths of the faith, but even more so in training the affections and character of the students for the life which awaited them. Not content with meeting the "Divines," as they were called, in the classroom, every Thursday was devoted to private interviews with those of his pupils who chose to avail themselves of the permission to come to see him. By means of this intercourse, and the walks and rides which he took with his pupils, a considerable intimacy ensued, and Ward acquired great personal influence over them. This was a matter of much satisfaction to him. No position in the world could equal that of a Catholic priest in his eyes; his own considerable worldly station, not only his wealth, but his intellectual excellence, he held to be less than nothing compared to the honour of serving the poorest and humblest mission chapel; and such a career being out of the question for himself, he derived great contentment from the fact that he was engaged in forming the priestly character in others; and this caused him to look on the years spent at St. Edmund's as the happiest and most useful of his life. The world, as in the old simile, he looked upon as a battlefield between good and evil, the camp of Christ and the camp of Satan. The Catholic Church was the main army on which the Devil concentrated his attacks; her priests were not only the principal champions of the faith, but also the victims first singled out for the arts and attacks of the Evil One. To fortify the future priests of the Church, to provide them with arrow-proof armour, and so make sure they should come off victorious in the warfare before them; here, indeed, was work worthy of the deepest and brightest intellect, the importance of which it was impossible to overestimate.

"The College chapel at Old Hall impressed his imagination

as the scene of far more important events than Downing-street. 'What place do you think in all England does the Devil look to for his most dangerous work?' he suddenly asked of the Vice-President, in the course of a walk. 'That building,' he continued, pointing to the College, and he proceeded to explain his meaning. 'The Catholic religion is the great hope of England. The advance of Catholicism depends, under God, almost entirely on a good priesthood. The large majority of priests are formed at the College. If he can succeed in damaging the priestly spirit at the College, the bulk of England's priests are damaged, and the country is irreparably injured.'"

Ward by no means confined himself to teaching the bare doctrines of the faith. In his hands theology was not a mere abstract science, but one the truths of which must form the foundation of our daily life. "He enlarged his acquaintance with the literature of the interior life, which ever had been so attractive to him, and endeavoured to blend it with dogmatic theology." To bring the truths of the Gospel into the practical life of his pupils, was his main object. The intellect, no doubt, must apprehend the scientific side of theology; but far more important was it that the heart and affections should seize the points discussed, and strongly desire the opportunity to work them into practical results.

The deep and intense interest which Ward took in his work caused it after a while to be injurious to his health. Not content with preparing and delivering the lectures themselves, at their conclusion Ward would propose a series of questions relating to what he had just been saying. To these questions the students were required to write their answers, which would show whether or not they had mastered the subject of the lecture, and Ward would carefully examine and correct all they wrote. The mere labour of reading these hundreds of pages was heavy, and it was this considerable and self-imposed task that brought on his first illness.

Ward's life was so completely absorbed by the interest he took in teaching at Old Hall, that he cared for few distractions. As we have already remarked, the theatre was his principal pleasure; and this, with a few dinner-parties, attending Cardinal Wiseman's receptions, and many talks



with Father Faber, formed all the dissipation he allowed himself in the years he passed at St. Edmund's. During his Oxford days, Ward had made Faber's acquaintance; but it was not until they both became Catholics, that any real intimacy arose between the two. From 1852 to the end of Faber's life, ten years later, he was Ward's director, and also amongst his nearest and dearest friends. Their friendship may have arisen more in the contrast between their main characteristics, than in any sympathy between their very opposite natures. Never was there a man more distinctly a poet-born than Faber—one whose vivid imagination and power of musical utterance had, in his early youth, attracted Wordsworth, and caused the Laureate to prophesy that in Faber we should see the uprising of a great poet—never, perhaps, a more strictly logical, and even mathematical cast of mind than Ward's. And yet, in their vital interest in all that concerned the Church, in their singleness of purpose in working for God's glory, and in their intense realization of the true faith, they found bonds of union more binding than an original similarity of nature. Notwithstanding Ward's warm affection for Faber, the former could not overcome his inborn distaste to listening to sermons, even when the eloquent and fervid Oratorian was the preacher. In the early days of the establishment of the Oratory in London, it was located in King William-street, Strand; not, however, for long; and when the Fathers moved to Brompton, the building which had served them for a church, was converted into a theatre. "Last night," remarked Ward to Faber, "I went to see an excellent piece at the King William-street Theatre. Between the acts, two thoughts came into my head. The first was, the last time I was in this building I heard Faber preach. The second was, how much more I am enjoying myself to-night than the last time I was here."

In 1864 Cardinal Wiseman died, and the appointment of a worthy successor was naturally of supreme importance in the eyes of all interested in the Church's welfare, foremost amongst whom was Ward. As is detailed at some length in the volume before us, the Liberal Catholic Movement, which

had its origin in the schools of Döllinger, in Germany, and of Montalembert, in France, was at this time beginning to spread in England, and unfortunately attracted some of the most cultivated and intellectual Catholics. To Liberal Catholicism, Ward was heart and soul opposed, and the amount of support or distrust which it would encounter on its appearance amongst us, must, to a great extent, depend on the disposition of the ecclesiastic nominated to the see of Westminster. From the first, Ward ardently desired the appointment of Dr. Manning, though, as in the case of Faber, the two men were of very different temperaments. They had of late been mutually drawn together with the common object of combatting Liberal Catholicism, and of insisting on the submission that was due, not only to the formal decrees issuing from Rome, but also to the known opinions and wishes of the Holy Father—which submission was generally denied or minimized by the Liberal school. Of course, Manning's power would be immensely increased should he be placed at the head of the Church in England.

The opposition to Dr. Manning's appointment is too well known to require being enlarged on here. He himself considered that he had not the remotest chance of being chosen; and Monsignor Talbot, who was in close intimacy with Pius IX., writes: "In consequence of the opposition of the episcopate, clergy, and the majority of the laity of England, I never thought it possible that he should ever be Archbishop." He adds, a little lower down, that, so great is his confidence in Manning, that he feels sure that in a few years his opponents will exclaim: "The Pope was right, and we were wrong!" a prophecy which, as we recall the almost world-wide cry of sorrow that arose so lately on the occasion of the Cardinal's death, was very literally fulfilled. Ward was beside himself with joy at the nomination of his favourite. His son, to this day, remembers his father rushing into the room, holding a telegram in his hand, jumping over a chair in his excitement, and crying out, "Henry Edward, by the Grace of God, Archbishop of Westminster;" and he at once proceeded to his chapel to sing a *Te Deum* of thanksgiving. Ward had lately been troubled with sleeplessness, and as

this became less about the time we are speaking of, he writes to his wife: "Good sleep at night, and a good Archbishop by day, are adequate for human felicity."

Not very long after, Ward ceased to hold his official post at St. Edmund's; he undertook the editorship of the *Dublin Review*. It was not without considerable misgiving that he consented to do so; and, with characteristic exaggeration, he states that it is certainly "a new phenomenon to have the editor of a quarterly profoundly ignorant of history, politics, and literature." Cardinal Wiseman, however, who feared lest the *Dublin Review* should lose its religious and Catholic aspect, and become a mere political organ, of which at the time there was some danger, overcame Ward's scruples, and persuaded him to undertake its management.

The times were then somewhat critical, and the same reasons which made the appointment of a firm, and, as some might style it, an extreme Catholic, as Archbishop very desirable, also made it important that the Pope should possess a literary organ in this country, the loyalty of which was unquestionable. We have already stated that in England, and still more in Germany and France, the Liberal school of thought was becoming more active in its propaganda, and more dangerous in its utterances. In England the only Catholic periodical of any literary merit, the *Home and Foreign Review*, was entirely in Liberal hands, and a powerful antidote was needed to counteract the mischief of its teaching. This, the Cardinal undoubtedly secured when he induced Ward to take charge of the *Dublin Review*. His hatred of Liberalism was only equalled by the firm and steadfast loyalty of his devotion to the Church, and especially to the Holy See. This last was important, as it was in their attacks on the prerogatives of the Pope that the Liberal Catholics were most active and persisting. No doubt, the times were stirring, and the years pregnant with coming events of serious moment to the Church. In 1865, a Commission of five cardinals was appointed in Rome, to confer on the Council which was projected. Ward had already been keenly debating the extent of Papal Infallibility in the *Dublin Review*, and was very anxious to have the matter

argued out and more clearly defined in the coming Council ; and for the next five years the *Dublin Review* was the main organ in England of what, in those days, was styled Ultramontaniam. It soon held the field alone, for the *Home and Foreign Review* had by this time become so distinctly disloyal, and so extreme in the ultra-Liberalism of its views, as to justify its being silenced altogether by those in authority ; and the *Dublin Review* then remained the only English Catholic periodical of importance.

"You will find me," said Ward to his sub-editor on the latter's appointment to the post, "you will find me narrow and strong—*very* narrow and *very* strong." And if we bear in mind the danger of the times, we can see that it was well that the important post of guiding English Catholic opinion in those days was in the hands of a man who kept straightly, even if narrowly, to the question at issue. In Germany, Döllinger was preparing the way for revolt. In France, Montalembert, though in a less questionable manner, was giving utterances to doubtful views on such delicate points as the proper relations between Church and State—this too, be it borne in mind, at the very time when Italian political aggression was pressing hard on the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See ; and on liberty of conscience, and this also at a period when laxity of conduct and crudity of opinion were both claiming the sanction of an ill-regulated conscience. In England, partly owing to Ward, Catholics had no excuse for being entrapped by the fallacies of the distinguished men mentioned above. With equal ability, and far greater loyalty, he guided the public mind amid the quicksands that wrecked the learned German and his school. If he erred, and in the end he himself admitted that he may sometimes have been exaggerated in his statements, and have forced principles further than they could legitimately be carried, yet he erred on the side of safety ; and, at any rate, England has been spared any open rebellion, or the formation of a new schism, however insignificant in its character and numbers.

The good which Ward was conscious of effecting by his writings was not an unalloyed pleasure. He loved the truth,



but he hated controversy, specially when directed against those whom he respected, as he did such Liberals as the late Sir John Simeon and Mr. Monsell, now Lord Emly; and still more so, when it brought him into antagonistic contact with the man he loved and revered above all others, John Henry Newman—and in these years they were not at one on many important questions. The subjects discussed in the *Dublin Review* interested Ward profoundly; but when a personal element was introduced into the controversies, it tried him beyond measure. He often said: "Many people look on me as a kind of theological gladiator, who delights in fighting; or a theological Red Indian, who is only at home in war paint. They little know what a coward I am, and how I hate fighting. If it wasn't for the infinite harm Liberalism is doing, I could never bring myself to write against it." His feeling for the individual, whilst most actively combatting his views, would retain all the tenderness of deep affection, and this specially in the case of Newman. The latter appears to have been conscious of the hold he had on Ward's feelings, even when he opposed his well-known wishes. Newman writes of Ward: "I have not a word to say against him. He has ever in feeling been kinder to me than I to him . . . He is thoroughly honest and above board . . . He says out all he thinks; and in the mildest, most affectionate manner, would call me an unmistakable heretic."

This was written in connection with Newman's statement that Ward "had much to do in keeping him from Oxford;" and undoubtedly the latter strongly opposed a scheme which at one time looked fairly promising, viz., that of founding a Catholic college at Oxford, under Dr. Newman. The Liberal Catholic School in England were strong advocates of the education of young Catholics at the National Universities, and Newman so far agreed with them as to be prepared to found an oratory at Oxford, with the object of bringing Catholic influence into the place, and providing Catholic students with the requirements of their religion. How far the future cardinal's unique and magnetic personality might have secured his object, it is impossible now to

say. As a Protestant, it is well known, his power had been very great; but Oxford in the thirties and Oxford in the sixties were very different places. At the later date it was permeated with the spirit of indifferentism; and the opponents of Newman's scheme feared more from the effects of religious indifferentism on the Catholic undergraduates than they hoped for good to the ordinary Protestant students from his influence. The plan was never carried out, and perhaps with Ward more than with any other man rests the responsibility that it was not even attempted. His opposition was open and undisguised. He felt so strongly the danger of allowing young Catholics to be brought in contact with the prevalent religious indifferentism at the age when an impression, once made, is likely to leave its character on the whole nature of the man, that he opposed the proposal of having a Catholic college at Oxford with all his energy. Definite dogma and the infallibility of Papal decrees were, no doubt, of vital importance; but to the average Catholic layman still more vital was the question, as Ward put it: "How far are Catholics to live, as it were, in the atmosphere of Infallibility?" In other words, what is to be the tone of mind and bent of character of the ordinary Catholic? "A great intellectual movement is beginning," he wrote, "amongst English Catholics, of which, indeed, the excitement about university education is one characteristic sign. This intellectual movement will take a totally divergent direction at its very outset, according as the body of leisured Catholics are animated by the orthodox or the minimizing spirit." Expose young men to the atmosphere then prevalent at Oxford—an atmosphere which, when freely breathed, destroyed all definite faith whatsoever—and you make the task of forming good Catholics an all but impossible one. "The thoughts of youth are long thoughts, and it would be hard indeed to engraft the dogmatic character on an indifferentist training."

Ward truly held that, independently of Catholic doctrine, there exists a real, though not easily defined ethos, called the Catholic spirit, in the same sense that there is a Protestant spirit and a sceptical spirit; and he inferred that,

without going so far as the denial of the doctrines of the Church, the spirit would be in danger of losing touch with the doctrines, were it brought in contact, at a critical time of life, with the spirit of indifferentism then reigning unchecked at Oxford. "Catholics throughout the world are instructed in certain *doctrines*, are exhorted to certain *practices*, are encouraged in certain *tempers and dispositions*. The Church's office in providing for this is no other than her 'Magisterium,' whereby, as Father Perrone expresses it, 'she leads them by the hand, as it were, along the path of eternal salvation.'" Childhood and youth are the seasons when impressions of a lasting character are most easily received, and, in consequence, Ward held that it was impossible to exaggerate the importance of preserving the purity of the Catholic atmosphere during the whole of a Catholic's education; and that the risk, therefore, of placing young men at Oxford was too serious to be attempted.

Not that Ward held that the thoroughly loyal and well-trained Catholic was called on to refrain from mixing with the ordinary world of England. He himself freely read, argued with and refuted the views of sceptics like Stuart Mill, and Herbert Spencer, and associated in the Metaphysical Society with agnostics like Huxley, and with theists like Martineau. But, in order to be safe in such company, he went there thoroughly fortified with the mastery of Catholic principles, and armed at all points with a wide and deep knowledge of Catholic theology. It was rash and even cruel to imperil mere striplings where the hardened warrior might tread, not alone without danger, but with every hope of coming off victorious in the combat. "Go heedlessly into the modern world of thought," Ward says, "and you unconsciously assimilate its principles. Fortify yourself beforehand with an antidote to each false principle, and you are safe."

Another subject, though of a different nature to mixed education, was about this time being advocated by the same men, viz., the union of the Catholic Church and the English Establishment. There was, no doubt, much to admire in the change of spirit amongst Protestants, who from being amongst the most malignant of the Church's

enemies, had so far improved, as earnestly to desire to be at one with her; and such a change deserved gentle and charitable treatment. But, though charity is great, truth is greater; and when more closely examined it was easy to see that, in order to meet such proposals as those contained in Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, Catholic truth must be minimized, and much, which although not perhaps strictly defined, yet forms an important part of a Catholic's devotional life, must be altogether ignored. Indeed, in the end, the whole scheme of corporate reunion proved to rest on an almost childish, though an amiable delusion, which had no more serious basis than the fortifications an infant may build with the sand of the sea-shore. The scheme may be stated in a few words as a proposal made by a certain fraction of Protestants, infinitesimally small, and possessing no authority of any kind to treat with the Church on a more or less give-and-take principle. If Catholics would ignore and allow Protestants to explain away in our devotions all that was distasteful to them or questionable in their eyes, they, on their side, would do their best to accept the strictly literal interpretation of the bare decrees of our Councils. Such was the generous offer made to the Church by a handful of Englishmen, who, we need hardly add, were distinctly repudiated by the bulk of their co-religionists. These advances were, however, nipped in the bud; and this was fortunate, for a few years later, when the Vatican Decrees were promulgated, the true schismatical spirit which is inherent in Anglicanism was at once evident. These decrees the re-unionists averred they could never accept; and thus, even had we taken any steps towards absorbing the Establishment into the Church before the Council took place, our work would have been futile. We should have been met by a positive denial of a positive dogma, which no minimizing could interpret into meaning the same thing as a loyal acceptance. The question of mixed education and of re-union, Ward treated together. He strongly disapproved of both, and says:—

"In each case to reduce the guidance of Rome, devotional and doctrinal, to a minimum, is to surrender the true principle



of unity and stability. Unity can be found only in subjection to Rome, hearty and profound unity only in hearty and profound subjection. The spirit of mutual concession, on the other hand, involves 'minimum' on both sides as a necessary condition; and 'minimism' is essentially a dissolvent force."

As we observed before, though abhorring Liberal Catholicism with a holy and sometimes a very active hatred, Ward retained the strongest affection for his Liberal Catholic friends, even whilst opposing them. A remarkable case in which his private feelings were altogether at variance with his public action, was on the occasion when his neighbour, Sir John Simeon, stood for Parliament, for the Isle of Wight. This was in 1865 when Ward's dread of the Liberal spirit in religion was at its height. Sir John was a pronounced Liberal Catholic, and therefore in Ward's eyes the last man to whom he wished to commit the interests of Catholicism in the House of Commons. His opponent was a Protestant Tory of the old school, who did his best to profit by the "No Popery" cry which he was able to raise against Sir John, and to whom the shades of difference between a Liberal and an Ultramontane Catholic were quite undiscernible. The position in which Ward found himself placed was sufficiently paradoxical. He had not a moment's doubt as to the candidate he would support. An avowed enemy was better than a treacherous friend; and though, as a man, Sir John Simeon was loyalty itself, yet Ward held all Liberal Catholics to be traitors to the Church and to the faith. As a result, he, the most fervent of Catholics, was congratulated by the *Conservative Standard* on putting his politics before his religion, and remaining faithful to the Tory traditions of his family, although by doing so he opposed a co-religionist. Ward's indignation at such unwelcome and questionable praise may be imagined. He wrote to the editor to say he did not care two pence about conservative traditions compared to religious interests, which interests were the very ground of his opposition to Sir John Simeon. In the end, Ward himself found that his position was so entirely misunderstood, that he was driven to retire from the active part he was taking in the election,

and although he voted for the conservative, he left his committee.

With the Council of 1870, and the promulgation of its decrees, Ward's days of battle with his co-religionists may be said to have ended. He had no love for controversy in itself; and Rome having spoken, and the Catholic world having accepted her teaching with docile submission, he was content to let the questions which he had previously so fiercely debated, rest in peace. He now turned his attention to subjects which, if less interesting to Catholics, were of more moment to the general world of philosophers.

The Metaphysical Society had lately been started in London. Its aim was to bring together men of the most varied, adverse, and antagonistic views, with the object of discussing their differences in an open and friendly spirit; and Ward was amongst its earliest members. The Agnostic spirit was then at its height, and religious men of all denominations were anxious to meet it face to face, and to prove to her assailants that Christianity, from the mere philosophical point of view, and independently of the divine gift of faith, could hold her own in the struggle that then raged. The debates, from the nature of the case, were never published, and a certain amount of secrecy was observed as to the views advanced by different speakers. The mere mention, however, of the names of some of the more prominent members will suffice to show the wide diversity of opinion held in the society. Huxley and Tyndall, the extreme scientific Agnostics, were confronted with Cardinal Manning and Father Dalgairns. The keen, sceptical lawyer, Sir James Fitzjames Stephens, was opposed to the dreamy, eclectic journalist, Mr. R. H. Hutton; whilst a leading Unitarian minister, Dr. Martineau, was brought face to face with the *soi disant* orthodox and gentle Dean Church.

It was prophesied that the meetings would be few, and that the society must inevitably be broken up at an early date. The differences of opinion, it was supposed, were too deep, and touched men too nearly, to admit of amicable discussion. "We all thought it would be a case of 'Kilkenny

cats," said Huxley; "hats and coats would be left in the hall, but there would be no owners left to put them on again." The very reverse was actually the case, and is a standing proof of the amount of friendly recognition which can be effected by personal *rapprochement*, and to the fact that, although the world is never likely to be all of one mind, yet that fundamental differences on the most important questions, need not necessarily be accompanied by bitterness or want of charity in their discussion. On a subsequent date Father Dalgairns remarked, "We have not converted each other, but we certainly think better of each other." "The society died of too much love," was Huxley's way of expressing the same idea. Until failing health forced Ward to resign his membership, the meetings of the Metaphysical Society were amongst the principal interests of his later years; and from the opinions expressed in this volume by many distinguished members of the society, he was certainly amongst the foremost, if not the very foremost debater; and the special merits of his keen intellect were thoroughly appreciated by those most opposed to his conclusions.

Meanwhile, the years were steadily advancing, and although Ward's mind showed to outsiders no sign of growing weakness, he himself became conscious of the necessity for a certain amount of reserve in the use of his brain-power. He could now only stand a limited amount of hard reading, and by diverse stages would let himself down during the day from the study of scholastic philosophy in the morning, through Newman and Anthony Trollope, to the perusal of a French play, which was all he felt equal to, in the evening. Ward had built himself a house at Weston Manor, near Freshwater, on the highest and most bracing spot in the Isle of Wight, described by a visitor as being "windy and dogmatic;" and here, amid congenial society, he wore away his later years, only varied by an occasional move to Hampstead. He was more than usually fortunate in his country neighbours. Tennyson's home was not far off; Mr. Watts, the accomplished artist, lived hard by; and Mrs. Cameron, a lady remarkable for her friendships with many of the most distinguished men of her day, was close

at hand ; and Ward shared with her the pleasure of the visits which these last were constantly paying to their friend. He also founded a mission at Weston Manor, and had a chapel in his house ; and thus every spiritual, as well as every intellectual need, was well supplied. It was, however, not in the Isle of Wight, but at Hampstead, that the end came at last, when, after some weeks of illness, accompanied by great suffering, borne with resignation and patience, he passed away, in July, 1882.

EVELYN MORDAUNT.

---

## IRISH INTEMPERANCE : ITS CAUSES AND REMEDY.

" TELL me what you know about Ireland," said a Chicago teacher to his class of boys. "Please, sir," and the eyes of the American small boy glistened as he answered, "please, sir, the people there all wear green, and live on whiskey." For nations as for men it is always useful, and often necessary, to know what their neighbours think and say of them ; to know how far and in what way they are criticized and censured, or the reverse. The Scottish poet sang :—

" O wad some power the giftie gi'e us,  
To see oursel's as ithers see us ;"

and his own career is a striking proof of how rare the gift is, and, when possessed, how hard it is to use it. The daily work of preacher, playwright, novelist, and poet is "to hold the mirror up to nature ;" yet most of those that look therein fix their gaze on the reflected faces of others ; very few on their own. Such is human nature ; and in this matter what is true of individuals is, for an obvious reason, true also of peoples. Nevertheless there is no rule without an exception ; and however easily we may explain away the exaggeration of the first part of the American youth's



answer, most observant men will admit that in the second part there is an alarming deal of truth.

It is now generally recognised that excessive indulgence in alcoholic drink has assumed in Ireland the dimensions of a national vice ; and the problem is, how to prevent its development into national disaster. Political economists tell us of the great wave of industrial depression that from time to time sweeps over various countries of Europe, and even America, bringing low prices, and consequent suffering and misery, to the population ; and, when it has spent itself, passes on, to be followed, sooner or later, by another ; and no one knows why. The phenomenon is there ; the theory to explain it satisfactorily has not yet appeared. Even now countries never affected before are borne down by industrial misfortune, while the wise men of the world fight over the why and the wherefore. In the domain of morals we observe a like phenomenon—a wave of alcoholism seems to have passed over certain nations, and is even now engulfing some—not for the first time—in its gloomy depths. Sweden, in the middle of this century, for ten years or more, was a very morass of intemperance ; yet it is now a fairly sober country. Switzerland, for the first time, is feeling the deadly effects of alcohol, and one-half of its conscripts are found to be physically unfit for service ; while in Ireland the years preceding 1840 were soaked with the drink and the tears of our population. Happily for us, owing to the giant labours of Father Mathew, the evil passed away, and after an interval of comparative freedom it is now again upon us. Why ? Putting aside the question as to whether any theory can be formulated that will explain the phenomenon in general, as applied to all the countries affected, we can, at all events, venture to say that, as regards our own nation, the wise men do not quarrel about the main cause, however they may differ in points of detail.

Certain causes are given for the spread of intemperance : some are agreed on by all as largely working the ruin we deplore ; to some is attached undue importance ; while others are entirely overlooked. And first among the causes let us place the Irishman's love for sociality and companionship

The Celtic nature is warm, the Irish particularly so; and pre-emminently it must be said of our countrymen that amongst them, at all events, "man is a social being." That our people do not lose this instinct in foreign lands, is proved by the well-known fact that in America and Australia they invariably seek the towns, and will not settle in rural districts, like the English and Scotch, even with large inducements. It was this gregarious disposition, backed up by a liberal supply of good nature, that first introduced the custom of "treating;" and this custom once established, the evil was done; for the average Irishman is the soul of honour and the slave of human respect. Break down this custom to-morrow, and Ireland is sober again. Whether such a task is possible, is another question, and one on which some, at all events, have formed very decided opinions.

Drink, once introduced at festive gatherings, was soon found to be a valuable help to the hilarity of the occasion, and in process of time it grew to be indispensable. From the fair, the wedding, and the dance, it passed to the christening, the wake, and the funeral; till it could be said with truth that "man, who comes into the world and goes out of it in tears," did so in Ireland "in whiskey." The infant would never have a day's luck, and would never grow up a credit to the family, if every friend and neighbour did not toast the unconscious newcomer till able to toast no more, and no man slept quietly in his grave whose family did not "bury him decent" by supplying unlimited grog at his wake and funeral. It is needless to say that habits of this sort led to a mixing up of obligations and duties ludicrous, if it were not saddening, among the many remarkable instances of which we have heard of the will of a dying man who left, among other bequests, "ten shillings for a Mass for his soul, and ten pounds for drink at his funeral." Extreme cases of this kind were, of course, rare, yet they show how far intemperance had gone, and how it had blunted the religious perceptions of the people.

All this time, while the people drank and fought, and spent their lives in riot and dissipation, a new and further danger was threatened. The drunkard might live his miser-

able days, and make his family unhappy ; but when he died his power for evil was gone. So the people thought, and so the people, with few exceptions, think still. That the thirst for drink is like many another disease, hereditary, and may be transmitted to the offspring, seems even now, though a universally received medical opinion, to be little known amongst educated laymen, and scarcely at all amongst the mass of the people. Herein lies the chief danger for the coming generation of Irishmen, and herein may be found the cause of those sad and ever-increasing cases of *animal* love for drink. In every town and every parish may be seen men of respectable birth, well reared, well educated, knowing full well the harm and the folly of intemperance, and yet who, at irregular intervals, will, on the slightest temptation, break into fits of drunkenness, continued for weeks at a time. See yonder man, with the flushed face and the shuffling step and unsteady gait. His clothes are tossed and muddy, his hair dishevelled, his face soiled and unshaven. With slouched hat and head bent low, he staggers, with shamefaced look, to the nearest public-house, and his hand trembles, and his lips quiver as they drink down the burning dose of poison. He knows that glass may get him into disgrace ; he knows it may cost him his position in life, and send him, with wife and family, to the workhouse ; he knows it may end in death and damnation, and in face of all he drinks it. Ask him why. The ready answer comes, "I cannot help it." See him when the fit is over, and what a change ! Erect, well dressed, tall of stature and lithe limb, he walks with easy grace, and shows in his very features the peace he feels within. Talk with him on the subject of drink, and he will tell you that when this paroxysm is on him he would brave the cannon's mouth to get one glass—aye, would walk through hell itself to grasp one bottle of whiskey.

Here we have intemperance as a disease, properly so called, born with the unfortunate man, and, sad to think and to say, most probably to remain with him till death. For, though many philanthropists have spent their means and time in search of a remedy ; though the researches of

medical men in this direction have been, especially of late years, painstaking and thorough, as yet both have failed to find a cure that will be, for the majority of cases, real and permanent.

And not merely are the children of confirmed drunkards liable to be infected with this hereditary drink disease, but even the children of tipplers; and this explains how, as the years have gone on, the number of volcanic drunkards as they may be described, has increased and multiplied to such an alarming extent. They smoulder or remain entirely inactive in our midst, and no one can say when they may burst into eruption, or what ruin and desolation they may spread round about them. Like the Lake District of New Zealand, the print of the traveller's footstep to-day may vomit sulphureous smoke to-morrow. The old saying has it, "When both ends of the house are on fire, it is hard to save the middle;" and though happily the phenomenon to which it refers is rare outside our largest cities, viz., both parents being given to drink, yet it can scarcely now be said with truth that female drunkenness in towns, and even country districts, is not often to be met with. Glance through the records of our police courts, week after week, visit our jails, visit our workhouses, and proof strong enough to excite our amazement and disgust will be forthcoming to show the extent of this branch of the evil. But all is not revealed there. Go into our towns, make inquiries in private circles, and it will be found that the demon of alcohol has, in many cases, selected as his victims women of wealth, of accomplishments, of talent, and of beauty. Again comes up the explanation, "It was born with them;" and thus, like fair flowers within the poisoned circle of the upas-tree, they droop their weary heads, they wither, and they die.

Among the causes of intemperance which have been, to a large extent, overlooked, is the system of landlordism in Ireland. The Irish peasant has for generations been accustomed to "drown all sorrows in a jug of punch;" and the fruitful source of the bulk of those sorrows has been the odious land tenure of our country. The Union caused absenteeism, and absenteeism caused that cruel, avaricious,



grasping spirit that made the Irish landlord a demon, in whose black heart there was no charity, no pity, no mercy. He ground his tenants as they grind the quartz in the Australian gold mines ; and woe to them if the yield was not ever increasing as they slaved on and on. When the bad season came, or ill-luck happened, the wretched tenants knew they had no mercy to hope for ; they became reckless, and drank to find comfort in forgetfulness ; when the crowbar had levelled their roof-tree, and the bailiff or emergency-man had turned wife and family into the wintry road, they sought oblivion in the friendly cup. What man, with nerve of steel and heart of adamant, could keep from drink when, with every coming dawn, he listened for the footfall of the evictor, and fancied he heard in every sound the measured tread of soldiery and police ? What man could spurn the glass when, hour by hour, he gazed upon his little ones, and saw before him and them the hated workhouse and a nameless grave ? The Italian sailor will broach the wine-cask when shipwreck threatens ; the condemned man will drink the opium-draught to banish the vision of the morrow's scaffold ; what wonder that the hapless Irish tenant should seek the fiery fumes that hid for the moment what to him was worse than shipwreck and the gibbet !

Another cause, usually overlooked, but which, nevertheless, goes to the root of the matter, is the fact that Ireland has been governed by an alien Parliament and an "English Garrison." England destroyed our manufactures in the last century, and drove the people back on the land as the only resource for a living. Poverty became widespread, and with it spread too the salve for the accompanying trouble of mind — whiskey-drinking. The people could not live on the land, therefore they took to "our only industry" as the best paying plan for a livelihood. The Government made little restriction, and having little interest in the down-trodden province, except to raise taxes, "gave the nod:" and the "garrison," its paid magistrates, and the "great unpaid," too, all Cromwellians and Protestants, granted licenses by the thousand. What matter if the "mere Irish" became drunkards, while the English Government reaped its rich

harvest of tribute therefrom? What did it signify to the Cromwellians and Protestants, if their Catholic slaves, like the Red Indians of America, drank themselves down to extinction? And not only did they grant licenses in abundance, but they and their fathers gave the example in taking advantage of them, for the record of the lives of the squires and the gentry of Ireland during the last century and a half of this is a record of duelling, immorality, and drunkenness. Thus did England foster by its encouragement and example what is now called an *Irish vice*, but, in reality, is nothing of the sort, but borrowed from our conquerors, the English. Thus far, we have specified some of the causes of intemperance. Is there a remedy; and if there be, what is it?

Father Mathew rose up in his day, and with mighty power swayed the multitude as he willed. He lifted his voice, and thousands hung upon his words; he raised his hand, and they knelt and pledged themselves for ever. He travelled from town to town, from city to city, and gathered up the drunken, the dissipated, and the vicious; the wild and reckless youth and the hoary old sinner; and he hedged them round with promises again and again renewed. The lanes and alleys gave up their lost ones; the cellars their besotted hags, and he sent them back pure, honest, virtuous. He found Ireland drunk; he left her sober. Has she continued so? "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is buried with their bones." He built, with giant labour, an embankment to the sea: but the spring tide came, and the storm blew, and there remained but here and there a solitary rock, lifting its blackened head above the surging waters. Many now hold, and their opinion has the facts of history to support it, that Father Mathew began at the wrong end. The movement was, indeed, magnificent, the enthusiasm unbounded, but high pressure in any department of nature cannot last. He was an apostle, but the apostle of his own generation, not of ours. He bade men avoid the danger, and he nerved them for the ordeal, but he made little or no effort to lessen or remove the occasion of their fall. Therefore, however effective for the time, the movement

wanted one, at least, of the elements of enduring success. For the same reason, it is held that the movement started a few years ago by the hierarchy and clergy, and taken up so warmly all over Ireland, is bound to be a failure ; for the number of public-houses is daily increasing, and with it the danger of intemperance for our lessening population.

What, then, is to be done ? Supply the one thing wanting in Father Mathew's movement and our own. Diminish the number of public-houses. Legislation on this point, "local option," if once passed into law, seems destined to make our people sober and happy. By all means keep the temperance movement going as it is ; but why not help by legislation ? If a doctor cures a disease by finding its cause, and destroying it ; if he prevents a relapse by taking away what might bring on a fresh attack ; plainly, the national disease must be treated in like manner. If a penitent is obliged to remove the occasion of sin, where possible, and is otherwise deemed unfit for absolution by a prudent confessor ; so, if we wish to cure the nation's crime, we must cut off the nation's danger. People no longer come home from New York with the ague, for the swamps have been drained and the forest cleared ; so, too, when the law reduces to proper proportions the drinking shops of Ireland, the national malady will disappear. It is urged as an objection to legislation, that it has not been successful in America, where it is put in force. In the States of Maine, Iowa, and Kansas, alcoholic drink is sold only in chemists' shops and as a medicine. This is the law of the State. But it must be remembered that the municipal authorities in a town may be unfriendly to this law, and where this occurs they give licenses ; and if a prosecution is carried on by the State Attorney, they being the magistrates, like O'Connell, "drive a coach-and-four through the Act," and so evade the object of the Statute. It has yet to be proved that in those towns in which the authorities are in harmony with the State, the enforcement of the law has not had most salutary results. We believe it has had such, and that where the effect has been neutralized by a development of the *shebeen* and private drinking saloon, that in such places the police and those

charged with the administration of justice have not done their duty. If magistrates and police had done years ago in Dublin as they are doing now, the number of "bogus clubs" could be counted at present on the fingers of one hand.

In the June Number of *The Lyceum* there is a remarkable paper on "Local Option" in Sweden. The writer tells us that before 1855, in consequence of the "practically unrestricted distillation and sale of spirits, every peasant's house in the kingdom was poisoned by the alcoholic infection," and that "between the years 1850 and 1855 the average consumption of the spirit drinkers of Sweden was about twenty-one gallons yearly per head," and he quotes from a pamphlet by Mr. Whyte the result:—"Moral and physical degradation, insanity, poverty, crime, family ties broken up, brutal habits, all those grim legions that ever range themselves under the banner of intemperance took possession of the land." The Government interfered, made laws restricting the traffic, and gave the people "local option;" and we find that in 1890, "the average consumption of spirits was one and two-third gallons per head of the population," and that now "rural Sweden allows herself only one spirit licence for every ten thousand inhabitants."

Is not the same thing possible in Ireland? Dublin had, in 1891, at the rate of one public-house for every three hundred inhabitants; and in many of our towns and villages the proportion is now as high as one for every one hundred and eighty. Our cities have been called "congregations of public-houses;" our towns and our villages are gatherings and groups of the same. The rational result is apparent to all. Why not then start a giant movement for restrictive legislation? Why not send monster petitions in support of the measures now before Parliament? Why not bring pressure to bear on our representatives to support these measures and supplement them? To defer the matter till our own Legislature can deal with it, is to run the risk of impossibility, for it may be found then that any serious diminution in the excise duties will annihilate the surplus and produce a deadlock.



In the State of South Carolina, on the 1st July of this year, a new scheme has been put into execution. By a law which came into effect on that day, every private bar in the State was closed up, and the sale of drink restricted to a few Government houses called "dispensaries," where it can be procured only as a medicine. There is much curious expectation as to how the arrangement will work, and thousands of saloon-keepers have been thrown out of employment. This last is the chief, if not the only objection, to restrictive laws in Ireland, for tens of thousands of our people would find themselves adrift on the world in the event of such a Statute being passed. But we do not read of this aspect of the case having produced much difficulty in Sweden; and even if the Government gave compensation for extinction of licenses, it would be money well spent for the peace and morality of our country, and the honour of the Irish race. At all events, the problem is not impossible of solution, especially in view of the expected impetus to our native trade and manufactures, and the result is certain to be prosperity, spiritual and temporal, of our long-suffering people.

T. DUNNE.

## ROS-MIC-TREOIN, CO. WEXFORD.—II.

### A HISTORICAL SKETCH.

WHATEVER may have been the distinguishing characteristics of the city built on the Barrow, in 1190, by the grand-daughter of Dermod M'Morrough, there is but little doubt that in the lapse of the seven centuries since gone by the place has undergone a transformation so complete that were it possible for the forefathers of Isabella's day to vacate their narrow cells, they would fail entirely to recognise the spot where they once lived, moved, and had their being. A reader of the chronicles and annals relating to the new city in the period of which we write would be disposed to treat the vaunted

description of the place as imaginary more than real. However, granting that there are very reasonable grounds for such suppositions, we must remember from the collateral evidences of history that most of the towns, Celtic monasteries, and some of the cathedrals themselves in Ireland before the period of the Norman invasion were structures of clay and wattles. The pillar-towers alone that overshadowed them, whether as land-marks, fire-houses, or treasuries, were almost the only buildings of stone that rose upon the plain. We read, too, that when the Norman allies of the King of Leinster marched to Ferns after the capture of Wexford, in 1169, they found the palace and the city buildings of his capital very inferior edifices indeed. Wherefore, then is it possible to realize that within so short a period after that time a city could be built by an Irish princess, which, according to the pen of the historian, could claim comparison with the famed London itself? It is also asserted that Ross was almost fated once to be the capital of Ireland; and in the rolls of Edward III., a century after its foundation, it is distinctly stated to have been at that date the most flourishing port in Ireland. A glimpse at the associations that surrounded the early life of the foundress of New Ross will go far to explain how much might possibly be expected from the work she undertook. Notwithstanding that the Princess Isabella was the living representative only of a fallen crown, as descendant of Leinster's last king, she enjoyed by the dispositions of fate all those advantages of education and foreign travel attainable in that day only by members of the royal house in Europe. On the death of her father, Strongbow, in 1175, she became the ward of the King of England, and was brought up at his court, where she received all the honours and privileges due her rank.

At that period the fairest provinces of France—over one-third of that kingdom—were ruled by the English crown. Henry Fitz-Empress by his maternal alliance was kindred with nearly all the thrones of central Europe. The English king was constant in his visits to his French dominions. Whether in accordance with pageantry of the time, his family and the members of his court usually accompanied him. Visits of

ceremony to other courts were not unfrequent, and the intercourse of European princes in those days of the Crusades reached an extent not since equalled, when in those expeditions all joined hands in the common cause on those fields of military glory. In the train of the court's companions to the English princesses, Isabella had often journeyed to France, and possibly had as much of the advantages of change and travel as the daughters of royalty in our time. The capitals of Touraine and Anjou—the fair towns of Normandy—the crested sites of Auvergne and Limousia—all were to her familiar scenes. The towers and battlements the palaces and cathedrals, of those famous cities, which still feast the traveller's gaze, were then in their first freshness and beauty, and it is not, therefore, difficult to imagine that under such influences with Isabella awoke the thought of founding a city such as some of these on her return to what she still looked upon as her ancestral kingdom. The Plantagenet policy with regard to Ireland prompted this aspiration of the Celtic heiress in believing, as Henry II. did, that the grasp of his new dominions depended vastly, if not entirely, on the allegiance or submission of that class of whose chieftainage Isabella would be the acknowledged representative. The marriage in which the English sovereign bestowed her hand on the most powerful and accomplished nobleman in his realms was, perhaps, the most skilful *coup d'état* in the whole annals of the Irish conquests. When this long-cherished dream of the wily Plantagenet was realized, the Irish heiress was free to return to her native kingdom amid all the circumstances of pomp and power—regal as a queen, but uncrowned.

The coronation of Richard I. and the marriage of Isabella took place almost at the same time, within the same year—1189—and immediately after the latter event the king set out for Palestine, having appointed the Earl Marshal Governor of England, and confiding to him the whole procedure of the conquest of Ireland. The inheritance of the Palatinate of Leinster, which, by the right of his wife, was now secured to Earl Marshal, gave to him a power in dealing with Ireland greater than all the weapons of conquest. The

claims of friendship, if not of fealty, to which the foundress of New Ross found she might still lay claim with her clansmen, are sufficiently evidenced in the fact that for more than a century after its foundation the town was *not* fortified. It was situate in the midst of the territory of the royal clan—Kavanagh—the most aggressive and predatory of the Irish septs: yet its buildings and its famous bridge, all the work of alien hands, were suffered to be raised without molestation, and its trade to be so developed as to mingle in a few years in commerce with most of the ports of southern Europe and the Levant. Better to strengthen those claims of friendship between the Norman and the Celt, the joint influence of the builders of the “New City” prevailed so with the council of the King, that, contrary to the border statutes then in force forbidding the levying of blackmail, permission was acceded to the citizens of New Ross to pay the Clan-Kavanagh ten marks yearly, in consideration of which the latter undertook to protect the town from the aggressive attacks of other neighbouring clans. After the death of Isabella and the extinction of her line in male succession, when her estates became vested in the five noblemen who had espoused her daughters, the ties of clanship and kinship, on which she had so relied when she built the city of her pride, began to wane. The Earl of Norfolk, to whose wife as dowry Ross fell, obtained a charter for the port and other valuable privileges; but notwithstanding all those favours, hatred of the stranger began to grow rankling in the clansmen’s bosoms. Soon afterwards, the old writers declare, the town became a prey to “the enemy” and a scene of perpetual depredation and crime.

The feeble tradition—one of the very few that linger on this historic scene—that ascribes the building of the walls of Ross to the munificence of a lady citizen named Rose, is altogether unfounded. No doubt the existence in life and deed of an individual bearing a like name is borne out by reference in the close rolls of Edward III. when in 1340, through the influence of Rose, widow of a wealthy burgess, Ralph Meyler, free passage to the port of New Ross for all vessels was granted by the King. From other documents



relating to her possessions, which included certain Crown lands, amongst the rest Montgarret, which formerly were part of the dowry of Earl Norfolk, there is no doubt of her own right. She was a lady of exalted lineage, probably that of the Geraldine, the Desmond branch of Croom. In the 29th year of Edward III. it is recited that thirty-six jurymen of Ross, on her promise of not marrying without licence, assigned to her a reasonable dowry out of the lands of her deceased husband. Rose is again mentioned in the same rolls as having broken her oath by re-marrying, without licence, Richard Duke of Waterford on the 12th July, 33 Edward III. The property so forfeited by this transaction was again released on payment of a fine by order of the King. The intrenchments of New Ross, and its subsequent fortifications, dated much earlier than the days of Rose of Croom. The original earthworks began to be raised around the town in 1265. In the well-known Norman ballad of Friar Michael Bernard, of Kildare, which has recently been referred to by a learned archæologist and writer of Irish history, as being one of the finest and most fact-dealing scraps of authentic Anglo-Norman history, a full description of the enclosure of Ross will be found. The document is in the Harleian MSS., and has been written both in Celtic and Norman French.

The extent of the intrenchment is there described as being a league in length and twenty feet in depth. In summing up the martial and civic force, the prowess of the town was very considerable. The poet enumerates three hundred and sixty-three cross-bow men, twelve hundred archers, and three thousand spearmen, one hundred and four horsemen—an aggregate which runs closely upon that which the entire population of Ross counts to-day. The mural fortifications of Ross would not seem to have been completed for many years after Friar Michael's date of its intrenchments. In the charter of Edward III., 1374, reference is made to its imperfect defences. And, even then, the proverbial wail of the town's decay, that ever dins upon its scenes, seems to have been in full cry. King Edward, in his charter at that time, concludes by compassionating the *grandi ruine*—great

decay of the town—and frees the Corporation from accounting to the Crown for their expenditure of the tolls levied, provided they sent a return of same to the Bishop of Ferns and the Abbot of Dunbrody, showing the receipts of such were levied in enclosing the town. Within the ensuing century the town defences were, no doubt, completed in a very imposing manner. Its gates were, by many writers of the Tudor period, referred to as some of the most beautiful in Ireland. The walls encompassing the league of the original intrenchment line, were entered by the north gate, south gate, bishop's gate, and Ald gate. The last named was later styled the Bewley gate : after Cromwell's siege (1640) it was called "three-bullet gate." Against it the three inquiring shots for surrender of the town were delivered ; and in the last siege of Ross (1798), at the same memorable spot, Lord Mountjoy met his death. The most beautiful of the gates of Ross was the bishop's gate, rebuilt in the early years of the fifteenth century, by Patrick Barrett, Lord Chancellor of Ireland and Bishop of Ferns. All the associations of this famous prelate and statesman are completely forgotten on the scene of his splendid labours, and even the site of his beautiful gate is now known by another name. The gate is gone—shattered, not by the besieger's cannon, nor corroded by the touch of age ; alas ! it has disappeared beneath vandalism's thoughtless hand, within the yesterday of our own time. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*

Since there are still near, and in New Ross, silent volumes of traceried stone, as beautiful and kindred to his bygone gate, around which it is meet once more to weave his memory, it may interest many readers to say a little of Bishop Barrett's career. He was a canon of Kells, in Ossory, and in the year 1400 was appointed to the see of Ferns by Pope John XXII., being consecrated at Rome. At the time English power had declined greatly in Ireland ; the clans of Wicklow and Carlow had discarded the jurisdiction of the Pale, and were resuming their former independence. Ferns, the seat of the bishopric, being a border town of Wexford, at its northern part, had quite fallen under their sway ; consequently, the

bishop, a few years after his consecration, obtained permission to move the seat of the episcopal see to New Ross, where more safety was ensured and better order prevailed. The records of the tenth year of Henry IV., 1409, recite that the royal permission was granted Patrick Barrett, Bishop of Ferns, to construct a castle of stone crenullated, in a place called Mountgarrett, and empowering him to "take *latimos et cementarios*, i. e., competent quarry-men and masons within the shires of Kilkenny, Wexford, and Waterford, to work in the construction of same for the tithes of said bishop." In the valley lying eastward of this castle, a rapid mill-stream, brawling over its stony bed, in its name still tells where once stood the episcopal granaries. In the lands stretching on towards the point of the defences of Ross by the bishop's gate, a small plot still bears his name, Barrett's Park.

His vast learning and accomplishments, together with the knowledge of ecclesiastical and civil law with which the bishop was justly accredited, led to his appointment, in the year 1410, to the important office of Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, in succession to Thomas Cranley, Archbishop of Dublin, at the hands of Henry IV. During his absence, as his new position compelled his residence in the capital, it would seem the spirit of disorder, which hitherto prevailed in the north of Wexford, spread over the whole county, and the Chancellor was ordered to return to his diocese, the better to protect it. He resigned the seals of office to the Crown in 1413, devoting the remainder of his time to study, and in writing a history of his predecessors in the see of Ferns. Bishop Barrett died on the 14th November, 1415, and his remains were, by his own request, borne to the abbey of Kells, in Ossory. To many readers, it must seem rather a strange fact that within the comparatively short period, during which this bishop occupied the see of Ferns, he should have expended so much of his genius, and ability, and munificence as a builder, at New Ross, a place where the circumstances of the time alone compelled his residence, and that only for little more than half the term of his episcopate. He never could have dreamed that this border town

would become the episcopal seat of so ancient a diocese as Ferns. If he chose it in his day, he knew it was only in the exigency of a passing hour. Mountgarrett Castle, the bishop's gate, the completion of the south transept of St. Mary's Church, within the walls, all were the work of his hands. However, it must be remembered his day was the day of building glory. Architecture had reached its most famous point. The apex of this perfection, in which beauty and science would seem to have joined hands, was found only in the Church. William of Wykeham had just lifted his pencil from the plans of Windsor Castle; his more heavenly inspirations were traced in the arches and pinnacles of his own cathedral and college of Winchester. Every prelate in the realm had almost become an architect. A perfect knowledge of the builder's art in the veriest beauty of its detail had come to be a part-qualification for the mitre, when such was mainly the gift of the sovereign. Under such influences something, and a great something, would naturally have been expected from the Bishop-Chancellor of Ireland. The beautiful Gothic gate of Ross, which he rebuilt, and to the site of which we trust this essay will re-attach the memory of Bishop Barrett, was the entrance through which his access to St. Mary's Church was ever made. In its reconstruction, the prevailing idea was to blend the civic with the ecclesiastical in its style. While it served its primary purpose of defence, it was made to form the main entrance to the beautiful church. Comparison of the fragments of this gate, and of ancient drawings still existing, with the workmanship in the south transept of St. Mary's, reveal in every detail the same spirit and style. The very material on which the chisel of the workman played, and the leaves and foliated capitals that he wrought, are alike in both.

J. CULLEN.



## Liturgical Questions.

---

### I.—TWO IMPORTANT DECREES OF THE CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

We have much pleasure in publishing, with a word of comment, the following important letter of the Congregation of Propaganda, obtained at the instance of His Lordship, the Bishop of Ardagh :—

S. CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE,  
ROMA, *li 2 Agosto*, 1893.

ILLMO. E RMO. SIGNORE.

La S. V. con la sua lettera del 16. corr. mese proponeva i seguenti dubbi : 1° Se a Lei spetti la nomina al Canonicato reso vacante nel suo Capitolo diocesano per la promozione di uno dei Canonici alla dignità di Decano ; 2° Se essendosi compiuta la Consacrazione di codesta Chiesa Cattedrale il dì 19. Maggio debba poi in quel giorno celebrarsene l'anniversario, o in quello stabilito per tutte le Chiese d'Irlanda, cioè la Domenica 2<sup>a</sup> di Ottobre ; ovvero possa scegliersi l'uno o l'altro. Ora quanto al primo, trattandosi di un beneficio vacante per promozione pontificia, dovrà esser conferito dallo stesso Sommo Pontefice, presentando la S. V. la consueta terna di Candidati.

Quanto al secondo, la S. C. dei Riti con Decreto 19 Febr., 1587, dichiara : “ Consecrator Ecclesiae potest in actu consecrationis statuere aliam diem pro anniversario huius consecrationis.” E con altro del 16 Ottobre, 1604 : “ Dedicationis Festum extra actum consecrationis non potest amplius mutari ab Episcopo inconsulta Sede Aplica.” Tuttavia essendo stabilito un giorno per l'anniversario di tutte le Chiese d'Irlanda, sembrerebbe espediente determinare il medesimo anche per codesta Chiesa Cattedrale : al che si concedono con la presente le opportune facoltà.

Prego intanto il Signore, che lungamente La conservi, e La prosperi.

Di V. S.

Devotissimo Servitore per l'Enno Prefetto

F. A. arciv. di Larissa Segr.

Per MGR. SEGR. C. LAURENTI, OFF.

MGR. BARTOLOMEO WOODLOCK,

*Vescovo di Ardagh.*

## [TRANSLATION.]

S. CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE,  
ROME, 2nd August, 1893.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST REV. LORD,

Your Lordship, by a letter of the 16th of last month, proposed the following questions for solution :—1°. If the appointment to a canonry, made vacant in your diocesan chapter by the promotion of one of the canons to the dignity of dean, belongs by right to your lordship.

2°. The consecration of your cathedral church having taken place on the 19th of May, whether the anniversary of the consecration should be celebrated in future at that date, or rather on the day established for all the churches of Ireland, viz., the second Sunday of October, or whether one or the other of these may be selected.

Now, with regard to the first, there being question of a benefice made vacant by Pontifical promotion, it should be conferred by the Sovereign Pontiff himself, your Lordship presenting the three names, as usual.

With regard to the second, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, in a decree of the 19th of February, 1587, declares, "Consecrator Ecclesiarum potest in actu consecrationis statuere aliam diem pro anniversario hujus consecrationis;" and in another of the 16th of October, 1604, "Dedicationis Festum extra actum consecrationis non potest amplius mutari ab Episcopo, inconsulta sede Apostolica." However, a day having been established as the anniversary of all the churches of Ireland, it would seem expedient to fix the same day also for your cathedral church, for which you are granted, by the present letter, the necessary faculties. At the same time, I pray God that He may long preserve and prosper your lordship.

Your lordship's most devoted servant.

For the Most Eminent Prefect F. A., Archbishop of Larissa, Sectr.

PER MGR. SEGRIO, C. LAURENTI. OFF:

MGR. BARTOLOMEO WOODLOCK,  
*Vescovo di Ardagh.*

With regard to the first question, we may point out that the reply given by the Congregation is couched in the most general terms, and applies to every benefice made vacant by Pontifical promotion. Consequently, there can be no doubt that every such benefice is to be filled, not by the Ordinary of the particular diocese in which it is situated, but directly by the Sovereign Pontiff himself.

The reply to the second question, on the other hand,

would seem to create a new difficulty rather than remove an existing one. In this reply the Congregation quotes two well-known decrees of the Congregation of Rites regarding the power of transferring the anniversary of the consecration or dedication of a church to a day different from that on which the consecration actually takes place. The first of these decrees affirms that the consecrating bishop can during the ceremony of consecration fix the anniversary on any day in the year; and the second declares that when the ceremony of consecration has once been concluded, the anniversary feast cannot be changed, *i.e.*, permanently, from the day on which the consecration took place to another day without special faculties from the Holy See. These decrees, as has been said, are well known, and present no difficulty. The difficulty referred to is contained in the concluding portion of the reply when read in conjunction with a decree of the Congregation of Rites, dated April 16th, 1842. In their reply to his Lordship the Bishop of Ardagh, the Congregation of Propaganda says that "it would seem expedient to fix the same day for the anniversary of his cathedral, which has been already established as the anniversary of all the churches of Ireland." Moreover, they transmit to his Lordship the necessary pontifical faculties for making this change in accordance with the second of the decrees of the Congregation of Rites quoted in their reply.

Now from the decree of the Congregation of Rites of 1842 referred to above, it would appear to be not only expedient to fix, as the anniversary day of the dedication of the cathedral of Ardagh, as well as of every other consecrated church or chapel in Ireland, the day on which the feast of the anniversary of the dedication of all the churches in Ireland is celebrated, but that to act otherwise would not be in accordance with the decrees of the Congregation of Rites nor with reason itself (*consonum non esse et Decretis Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis, et ipsi rationi*).

This decree was issued at the instance of Father Francis Joseph Nicholson, an Irish Carmelite, who on the same occasion submitted a number of doubts to the Congregation

of Rites. The third and fourth of these alone concern us at present, and are as follow:—

*Quæst.*—3. Utrum Regulares qui Sedis Apostolicæ indultum impetraverint dedicationem omnium Hiberniæ, nec non suorum Ordinum Ecclesiarum celebrandi, possint et debeant dedicationem quoque Ecclesiæ Cathedralis illius quæ degunt Dioecesis, absque Sedis Apostolicæ speciali indulto celebrare, cum Clerus Sæcularis, ut jam dictum est, dedicationem omnium Ecclesiarum Hiberniæ quotannis celebrat?

4. An teneantur, vel possint præterea Cleri Sæcularis Sacerdotes, et alii propriæ suæ Ecclesiæ dedicationem celebrare, sive Cathedralis illa sit, sive quavis alia?

*Resp.*—Ad 3 et 4. Dilata et ad mentem. Mens est ut per Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide scribatur Archiepiscopis Dublinensi et Tuamensi, nec non Episcopo Galviensi per modum Instructionis, quæ dicatur ad eandem Sacram Congregationem perlatum esse in eorum Dioecesibus, præter festum dedicationis omnium istius regni Ecclesiarum, quod habetur Dominica secunda Octobris, celebrari etiam diem anniversarium consecrationis propriæ Ecclesiæ Cathedralis, et quatenus ita se res habet huiusmodi morem consensum non esse et *Decretis Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis et ipsi rationi*, eo quod propriæ particularis Ecclesiæ Dedicationis Officium intelligitur comprehensum, et celebratum in Festo consecrationis omnium Ecclesiarum: ac propterea eandem Sacram Congregationem vehementer optare ut prædictum Officium Dedicationis propriæ particularis Ecclesiæ ex Calendario proximi anni expungatur.

It will be seen that the reason put forward in this reply of the Congregation of Rites for declaring the practice which it condemns to be not in accordance with its decrees or even with reason itself, is logical and convincing. "There is already," says the Congregation in effect, "a feast commemorating the anniversary of the dedication of *all* the churches in Ireland. But every consecrated church in Ireland is comprehended in the term *all*. Therefore, on the anniversary of the consecration of all the churches in Ireland, the anniversary of the consecration of every consecrated church in Ireland is commemorated." Hence, according to the mind of the Congregation of Rites, it would seem not only "expedient," but right, that the second Sunday of October should be the one and only anniversary for every consecrated church in Ireland, no matter on which day the consecration took place.



Again, along with their reply to his Lordship the Bishop of Ardagh, as has been already pointed out, the Congregation of Propaganda transmits faculties to enable him to transfer the anniversary of the consecration of his cathedral from the 19th May to the second Sunday of October. But, according to the reply of the Congregation of Rites, which we are now examining, it would seem that no such faculties were necessary. For according to our interpretation of this reply, the second Sunday of October, having been lawfully established as the feast of the anniversary of the dedication of all the churches in Ireland, becomes *de jure* the anniversary day of every newly-consecrated church. And, moreover, it would seem from this same reply, that, in this country, a bishop consecrating a church could not fix, even during the ceremony of consecration, any other day than the second Sunday in October; and that, for the reason already given, to fix that day would be superfluous.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile those two decrees. It may happen, however, that the Congregation of Propaganda never wrote the letter, which it was intended by the Congregation of Rites they should write to the Archbishops of Dublin and Tuam and to the Bishop of Galway. If they did not, then probably we may regard as a dead letter the reply of the Congregation of Rites. At any rate, the reply to his Lordship the Bishop of Ardagh, being later than the other, it is to be taken as an authoritative interpretation of the law as it now exists. Hence the conclusion we are to come to would seem to be that, besides the general feast celebrated on the second Sunday of October, the feast of dedication of particular churches which have been solemnly consecrated, is to be celebrated in these churches on the anniversary day of the consecration, or on such other day as the consecrating bishop may have duly appointed for that feast.

---

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE FEAST OF THE TITULAR OF  
A CHURCH.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly say if I am right in celebrating the Festival of St. Dominic, the titular patron of my

church, as a double of the first class, with an octave. I have, in common with all the clergy of our mission, the privilege of following the *Ordo* used by the Roman clergy. In fact, we have no other *Ordo*. I need scarcely say that my church has only been blessed. We have no consecrated church in our mission.

"In reciting the Office of the octave day of St. Dominic I have a difficulty about the lessons of the second nocturn. As I have no copy of the Roman *Octavarium*, I just say the proper lessons of the feast over again. Suppose I am within my right, seeing that the church was blessed by a bishop, and received the title of St. Dominic, am I bound to keep on celebrating the octave as I do at present?"

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I wrote to you by last mail asking for the favour of an opinion as to my action in altering the Roman *Ordo*, which I, together with all the clergy of this mission, have the privilege of using. I may now add that there is no other *Ordo* for this mission, but the bishop always inserts alterations for the festivals of the principal and secondary patrons of the mission. These patrons have, however, been approved of by the Holy See, and the principal patron has a special Sunday, in each year, appointed for its celebration by the Holy See. The alteration I make on my own responsibility, and according to my reading of De Herdt, is the celebration of the festival of St. Dominic, titular patron of the church and district over which I have charge, as a double of the first class with an octave. I wish now to ask four minor questions:—

"(a) Am I right in making the festival of St. Xystus, P.M. (11th Aug.) a simplex every year? The bishop does so with the saint whose festival occurs on the octave day of the principal patron; but as the latter is always a Sunday, it is not always the same saint who is 'simplified.'

"(b) If I am not right in doing so, should I appoint once for all a *dies fixa* for St. Xystus P. M.?

"(c) In commemorating the octave of St. Dominic on the 7th, 8th, and 9th August, should I give preference to the commemoration of the Transfiguration (first class with octave in the Roman *Ordo*)?

"(d) Am I bound to procure a copy of the Roman *Octavarium* to find lessons for the second and third nocturns of the 11th

August, octave of St. Dominic, or may I safely repeat those of the feast itself?

"I fear I am very troublesome, but I take a great interest in the Liturgical Questions in the I. E. RECORD; and though the above questions may not be practical ones for the Irish clergy, the discussion of them may throw light on similar difficulties that may arise.

"J. J. O'R."

1. Our correspondent is quite right in celebrating the Feast of St. Dominic as a double of the first class with an octave. Indeed, in celebrating the feast in this manner he is doing what he has not merely a right to do, but what he is bound to do. For it has been over and over again declared by the Congregation of Rites, and is taught by all writers on the Rubrics, that the Office of the patron or titular of a church—even though the church be merely blessed—should be celebrated as a double of the first class with an octave by all the clergy attached (*adscripti*) to that church. From the numerous decisions of the Congregation of Rites on this point we shall select the following which we find at hand, and which is moreover among the latest.

"*Quaer.* An in suo valore maneat altera obligatio, quae sub poena non satisfaciendi officio incumbit Parochis aliisque de gremio Ecclesiae, celebrandi sub ritu duplicis primae classis cum octava tam festum Titularis propriae Ecclesiae Parochialis, *etsi tantummodo benedicta*, quam anniversarium ejusdem Dedicationis si est consecrata?

"*Resp.* Affirmative quoad festum Titularis; Negative quoad Anniversarium Dedicationis Ecclesiae quae non sit consecrata."<sup>1</sup>

From this, as from so many other replies of the same Congregation, it follows—(1) that the feast of the titular of a church, though it be only blessed, must be celebrated according to the rite and manner described by the clergy of that church under pain of not satisfying the obligation of reading the Divine Office; and (2) that the anniversary of the dedication of a church is to be celebrated only in case the church has been solemnly consecrated.

2. (a) Our correspondent is not right in reducing the

<sup>1</sup> S. R. C., die 11 Junii, 1880, n. 5809, Dub. vi. 2.

Feast of St. Xystus to a *Simplex* every year. As he suggests there is no parallel between this case and that of the octave day of the principal patron of the diocese. For since the latter is always celebrated on a Sunday, the same saint's feast is not disturbed every year. The feast of St. Xystus should be transferred to the first vacant week-day, that is to the first week-day not having a feast of nine lessons. This will be the *dies fira* for the feast of St. Xystus, from which it cannot be disturbed unless for the same causes which would disturb it from its proper day.

(c) Precedence should be given to the octave of the Transfiguration. For both feasts being doubles of the first class, the one of lower dignity yields to the one of higher, and the Transfiguration is a feast of our Lord, and therefore of higher dignity than the feast of St. Dominic.

(d) No one is obliged to procure a copy of the *Octavarium*. It is a collection of sermons and homilies made by Gavantus and approved of by the Congregation of Rites. It is, therefore, lawful, and perhaps praiseworthy, to use it in celebrating the octave of a patron or titular, but there is no obligation. We are, of opinion, however, that, apart altogether from the question of the use of the *Octavarium*, our correspondent is in error in reading the proper lessons of the feast day in the second nocturn of the octave day. The proper lessons should never be repeated either on the octave day itself, or on any day within the octave, unless in the extremely rare case in which the titular or patron has no "common" in the Breviary. But when the titular or patron has a "common" then on the octave day as well as on all the days within the octave on which the office is *de infra octavam* the lessons are from the common. On the second day within the octave, or on the first day on which the office is *de infra octavam*—the same is to be understood in what follows regarding the third, fourth, &c., days within the octave—the lessons of the second nocturn are from the common *primo loco*, provided the lessons of the feast itself are proper; on the third day they are from the common *secundo loco*; on the fourth day again from the common *primo loco*, unless where



there is a third set of lessons in the common. In the case of the octave day of St. Dominic, the lessons of the second nocturn should be from the common *primo loco* : those of the first nocturn from the Scripture occurring, and those of the third nocturn also from the common *primo loco*.

D. O'LOAN.

## Correspondence.

### SEN-PATRICK.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—The Rev. S. Malone will not accept the theory that Sen-Patrick was Abbot of Glastonbury, which was put forward in the July Number of the I. E. RECORD ; and the reason of his disbelief in it is that it is ‘founded solely upon a document called *Charta Patricii*, which was forged by the monks of Glastonbury for the glory of their monastery.’ But this theory is founded mainly on tradition, and not on the *Charta Patricii*. The tradition, doubtless, is embedded in that document, and my words concerning it were:—‘This dramatic narrative, if not authentic, is probably founded on fact. The Saxon priest and biographer of St. Dunstan ; Osbern, the friend of Archbishop Lanfranc, and William of Malmesbury, in his book on the antiquities of Glastonbury, and in his Life of St. Dunstan, make known to us that there was a constant and widespread tradition that Sen-Patrick was the founder and first abbot of Glastonbury ; and the early Irish writer, St. Aenghus, in his *Felire*, commemorates Sen-Patrick of Glastonbury the teacher of the apostle of Ireland.

“The Rev. S. Malone gives no convincing proof that the *Charta Patricii* is a ‘foolish forgery ;’ and he gives no proof at all that it was ‘forged by the monks of Glastonbury for the glory of their monastery.’ Were *The Chronicles of Glastonbury* forged by British monks before the Saxon invasion ? But if these writings are not authentic, he knows nothing about British monks or a British monastery at Glastonbury then. Were these false miracles published by the Saxon monks of Glastonbury, after

the conversion of England, for the glory of an ancient British monastery? Or were they the work of the English and Irish teachers who dwelt together at Glastonbury in the time of St. Dunstan?

“The Rev. S. Malone doubts the genuineness of the *Charta Patricii*, on account of the miracles recorded therein, which, according to him, require corroboration; and he appeals to the authority of two well-known Protestant writers in support of his unbelief, as if all Protestant writers do not always protest against the miracles as well as against the teaching of the Catholic Church. *The Chronicles of Glastonbury* and the miracles related in the *Charta Patricii*, however, are fully corroborated by tradition by the Charter of King Ina to the Benedictine Monastery of Glastonbury, and by the testimony of the historian William of Malmesbury, who declares that he has gleaned what he writes in ‘writings found at St. Edmund’s’ and ‘in ancient British histories and traditions.’

“The Rev. S. Malone is somewhat incredulous about the building of a church in honour of our Lady at Glastonbury by direction of the Angel Gabriel; and the building of an oratory on Tor Hill, in honour of St. Michael, in the time of Pope Elutherus (A.D. 177); but who has not heard of our Lady of the Snow, at Rome? and Tor Hill was still called St. Michael’s Mount in the fourteenth century.

“I do not mean by these remarks to disparage in any way the undoubted deep and extensive learning of the Rev. S. Malone.—I remain, Rev. Sir, &c.

“A. BARRY, C.SS.R.”

## Documents.

---

### ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII. ON THE ROSARY.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII.  
EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHI-  
EPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS, ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM  
ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

DE ROSARIO MARIALI.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHI-  
EPISCOPIS, ET EPISCOPOS, ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS PACEM  
ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Laetitiae sanctae, quam Nobis annus quinquagesimus ab episcopali consecratione feliciter plenus adduxit, pergrata nimirum ex eo fuit accessio, quod omnes, per universitatem catholicarum gentium, non secus ac filios pater, consortes habuerimus, fidei et amoris significatione pulcherrima. In quo nova semper cum gratia agnoscimus et praedicamus Dei providentis consilium, et summe in Nosmetipsos benevolum et Ecclesiae suae haud leviter profuturum; neque minus avet animus, eiusdem beneficii optimam apud deum conciliatricem, Matrem eius augustam, salutare laudibus et efferre. Huius quippe eximia caritas, quam diuturno varioque aetatis spatio sensimus Ipsi multis modis praesentem, praesentior in dies ante oculos fulget, atque animum suavissime afficiens, fiducia non humana confirmat. Caelestis Reginae vox ipsa exaudiri videtur. Nos benigne tum erigentis in asperrimis Ecclesiae temporibus, tum consilii copia ad instituta communis salutis proposita adjuvantis, tum etiam admonentis ut pietatem unumque virtutis cultum in christiano populo excitemus. Talibus respondere optatis iam pluries ante hac jucundum Nobis sanctumque fuit. In fructibus autem qui hortationes Nostras, ipsa auspice, sunt consecuti, dignum est quod commemoremus, per ampla religioni sacratissimi eius *Rosarii* allata esse incrementa; hanc in rem sodalitiis quoque piorum qua auctis qua constitutis, scriptis, docto opportuneque in vulgis editis, ipsis elegantiorum

artium nobilissimis ornamentis inductis. Nunc vero perinde ac si eadem studiosissimae Matris excipiamus vocem, qua urgeat, *Citius, ne cesses*, rursus de mariali Rosario vos alloqui libet, Venerabiles Fratres, appetente octobri; quem mensem esse ei devotum, acceptissimo eiusdem Rosarii ritu, censuimus, tributis sacrae indulgentiae praemiis. Oratio tamen Nostra non eo proxime spectabit ut addamus, vel laudem precationi ex se praestantissimae, vel fidelibus stimulos ad eam sanctiore usu colendam: verum de nonnullis dicemus lectissimis bonis, quae inde hauriri possunt, temporum et hominum rationi maxime opportunis. Sic enim Nobis persuasissimum est, religionem Rosarii, si tam rite colatur, ut vim insitam virtutemque proferat suam, utilitates, non singulis modo, sed omni etiam reipublicae esse maximas parituram.

Nemo est quem fugiat, quantum Nos, pro supremi Apostolatus munere, ad civile bonum conferre studuerimus, ac porro parati simus, sic Deus adsit, conferre. Nam, qui imperio potiantur, eos saepe monuimus, ne perferant leges per easque agant, nisi ad normam acquissimam divinae Mentis; cives autem, qui ceteris, sive ingenio, sive partis meritis, sive nobilitate fortunisque antecellant, crebro adhortati sumus ut, consiliis collatis et viribus, res maximas potissimasque civitatis tueantur et provehant. Sed vero nimis multa sunt, quibus, ut modo est civilis consociatio, publicae disciplinae vincula infirmantur, atque populi a iusta morum honestate persequenda abducantur. Iam Nobis tria praecipue videntur teterrima in communis boni perniciem: ea sunt, *modestiae citae et actusae fastidium; horror patiendi; futurorum, quae speramus, oblivio.*

Querimur Nos, ipsique fatentur ultro ac dolent qui omnia revocant ad naturae lumen et utilitatem, vulnus humanae societati, idque vehemens, ex eo infligi, quod officia virtutesque negliguntur, quae genus vitae exornant tenue et commune. Hinc enimvero, in domestica consuetudine debitam natura obedientiam a liberis detrectari proterve, omnis impatientibus disciplinae, nisi si quae est voluptaria et mollis. Hinc opifices suis se artibus removere, defugere labores, nec sorte contentos, altiora suspicere, improvidam quamdam expetentes aequationem bonorum: similia multorum studia, ut, natali rure relicto, urbium rumores capiant effusasque illecebras. Hinc inter ordines civitatum aequilibras nulla; nutare omnia, animos simultatibus invidiaque torqueri, ius conculcari palam, eos denique, qui spe sint falsi, per seditionem



et turbas publicam tentare pacem, iisque obsistere quorum est illam tutari. Contra haec curatio petatur a Rosario mariali, quod simul certo precum ordine constat et pia mysteriorum Christi servatoris et Matris commentatione. Nempe *gaudiorum mysteria* probe et ad vulgus enarrentur, ac, veluti picturae quaedam inaginesque virtutum, in oculis hominum constituentur: perspiciet quisque, quam ampla inde quamque facilis, ad vitam honeste componendam, offeratur documentorum copia, mira animos suavitate allicientium. Obervatur Nazarethana domus, terrestre illud divinumque sanctimoniae domicilium. Quantum in ea quotidiana consuetudinis exemplar! quae societatis domesticae omnino perfecta species! Simplicitas ibi morum et candor; animorum perpetua consensio; nulla ordinis perturbatio; observantia mutua; amor denique, non ille fucatus et mendax, sed qui officiorum assiduitate integre vicens, vel oculos intuentium rapiat. Illic datur quidem studium ea parando quae suppedient ad victum et cultum; id vero *in sudore cultus*, et ut ab eis, qui, parvo contenti, potius agant ut minores egeant, quam ut plus habeant. Super haec omnia, summa tranquillitas mentis, par animi laetitia; quae duo recte factorum conscientiam nunquam non comitantur. Quarum exempla virtutum, modestiae nimirum ac demissionis, laborum tolerantiae et in alios benevolentiae, diligentiae tenuium officiorum quae sunt in quotidiana vita, cetera demum exempla, simul atque concipiantur sensim animis alteque insideant, sensim profecto in eis optata consiliorum morumque mutatio eveniet. Tum sua cuique munera, nequaquam despecta erunt et molesta, sed grata potius et delectabilia: atque, incunditate quadam aspersa, enixius ad probe agendum conscientia officii valebit. Ex eo mores in omnes partes mitescent; domestica convictio in amore et deliciis erit; usus cum ceteris plus multo habebit sinceræ observantiae et caritatis. Quae quidam, ex homine singulari, si late in familias, in civitates, in universum quempiam populum traducantur, ut ad haec instituta moderentur vitam; quanta inde reipublicae emolumenta sint obventura, apertum est.

Alterum, sane funestissimum, in quo deplorando nimii nunquam sumus, eo quia latius in dies deteriusque inficiat animos, illud est, recusare dolorem, adversa et dura acriter propulsare. Pars enim hominum maxima tranquillam animorum libertatem non iam sic habent, ut oportet, tanquam praemium iis propositum qui virtutis fungantur munere ad pericula ad

labores invicti: sed commentitiam quandam civitatis perfectionem cogitant, in qua, omni ingrata re submotâ, cumulata sit delectionum huius vitae complexio. Porro ex tam acri effrenataque beate vivendi libidine proclive est ut ingenia labefactentur; quae, si non penitus excidunt, at enervantur tamen, ut vitae malis abiecte cedant miserabiliterque succumbant. In hoc etiam discrimine, plurimum quidem opis ad spiritus roborandos (tanta exempli auctoritas est, ex mariali Rosario expectari licet; si *dolentia*, quae vocantur, *mysteria*, vel a primis puerorum aetatulis, ac deinceps assidue, tacita suavique contemplatione versentur. Videmus per ea Christum, *auctorem et consummatorem Fidei* nostrae coepisse *facere et docere*; ut, quae genus nostrum de laborum dolorumque perpessione docuisset, eorum in ipso exempla peteremus, et ita quidem ut, quaecumque difficiliora perpessu sunt, ea sibi ipse toleranda magna voluntate suscepit. Maestitia videmus confectum, usque eo ut sanguine totis artibus, veluti sudore, manaret. Videmus vinculis, latro-num more, constrictum; iudicium pessimorum subeuntem; diris, contumeliis, falsis criminibus impetitur. Videmus flagellis caesum; spinis coronatum; suffixum cruci; indignum habitum qui diu viveret, dignum qui succlamante turba periret. Ad haec, Parentis sanctissimae aegritudinem reputamus, cuius *animam doloris gladius* non attigit modo, sed *pertransivit*, ut ut mater dolorum compellaretur et esset. Virtutis tantae specimina qui crebra cogitatione, non modo oculis, contempletur, quantum ille profecto calebit animo ad imitandum! Esto ei quidem *maledicta tellus et spinas germinet ac tribulos*, mens aerumnis prematur, morbis urgeatur corpus; nullum erit, sive hominum invidia, sive ira daemonum, invectum malum nullus publicae privataeque calamitatis casus, quae non ille evincat tolerando. Hinc illud recte *Facere et pati fortia christianum est*; christianus etenim quicumque habeatur merito, Christum patientem non subsequi nequaquam potest. Patientiam autem dicimus, non inanem animi ostentationem ad dolorem obdurescentis, quae quorundam fuit veterum philosophorum; sed quae, exemplum ab illo transferens *qui, proposito sibi gaudio, sustinuit crucem, confusione contempta*,<sup>1</sup> ab ipsoque opportuna gratiae exposcens auxilia, perpeti aspera nihil renuat atque etiam gestiat, perpersionemque, quantacumque ea fuerit, in lucris, ponat. Habuit catholicum nomen, ac sane habet, doctrinae huius disci-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xii. 2.

pulos praeclarissimos, complures ubique ex omni ordine viros et feminas, qui, per vestigia Christi Domini, iniurias acerbitatesque omnes pro virtute et religione subirent, illud Didymi, re magis quam dicto, usurpantes: *Elamus et nos, et moriamur cum eo.*<sup>1</sup> Quae insignis constantiae facta etiam multiplicentur splendide, unde praesidium civitati, Ecclesiae virtus augescat et gloria!

Tertium malorum caput, cui quaerenda est medicina, in hominibus maxime apparet aetatis nostrae. Homines enim superiorum temporum, si quidem terrestria, vel vitiosius, adamabant, fere tamen non penitus aspernabantur caelestia: ipsi ethnicorum prudentiores, hanc nobis vitam hospitium esse, non domum, commorandi diversorium, non habitandi, datum docuerunt. Qui nunc vero sunt homines, etsi christiana lege instituti, fluxa praesentis aevi bona plerique sic consecantur, ut potioem patriam in aevi sempiterni beatitate, non memoria solum elabi, sed extinctam prorsus ac deletam per summum dedecus velint; frustra commonente Paulo: *Non habemus hic manentem civitatem, sed futuram inquirimus.*<sup>2</sup> Cuius rei explorantibus causas, illud in primis occurrit, quod multis persuasum sit, cogitatione futuorum caritatem dirimi patriae terrestis reique publicae prosperitatem convelli: quo nihil profecto odiosius, ineptius nihil. Etenim non ea sperandarum natura est rerum, quae mentes hominum sibi sic vindicent, ut eas a cura omnino avertant praesentium bonorum; quando et Christus regnum Dei edixit quaerendum, primum id quidem, at non ut cetera praeteriremus. Nam usura praesentium rerum, quaeque inde honestae habentur delectationes, si virtutibus vel augendis vel remunerandis adiumento sunt; item, si splendor et cultus terrenae civitatis, ex quo mortalium consociatio magnifice illustratur, splendorem et cultum imitatur civitatis caelestis; nihil est quod rationis participes dedeeat, nihil quod consilii adversetur divinis. Auctor est enim naturae Deus idemque gratiae; non ut altera alteri officiat atque inter se digladiantur, sed ut amico quodam foedere coeant, ut nempe, utraque duce, immortalem illam beatitatem, ad quam mortales nati sumus, faciliore veluti via, aliquando contingamus. At vero homines voluptarii, sese unice amantes, qui cogitationes suas omnes in res caducas humiliter abiciunt ut se tollere altius nequeant, ii, potius quam a bonis quibus fruuntur aspectabilibus aeterna appetant, ipsum plane amittunt aeternitatis aspectum, ad conditionem prolapsi indignissimam.

<sup>1</sup> Ioann. xi. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xiii. 14.

Neque enim divinum Numen graviore ulla poena multare hominem possit, quam quum illum blandimenta voluptatum, bonorum sempiternorum immemorem, omni vita consecrari permiserit. A quo tamen periculo ille profecto aberit qui, pietate Rosarii usus, quae in illo proponuntur *a gloria mysteria*, attenta repetit frequentique memoria. Mysteria etenim ea sunt, in quibus clarissimum chrisi tianis mentibus praefertur lumen ad suspicienda bona, quae, etsi obtutum oculorum effugiunt, sed certa tenemus fide praeparasse Deum *diligentibus se*. Docemur inde, mortem, non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed migrationem commutationemque vitae. Docemur, omnibus in caelum cursum patere; quumque illo Christum cernimus remeantem, reminiscimur felix eius promissum: *Vado parare vobis locum*. Docemur, fore tempus quum *absterget Deus omnem lacrimam ab oculis nostris*, et neque, luctus, neque clamor, neque dolor erit ultra; sed semper cum Domino erimus, *similes Dei, quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est; poti torrente coluplatus eius, Sanctorum cives*, in magnae Reginae et Matris beatissima communione. Haec autem considerantem animum inflammari necesse est, atque tum illud iterare Viri sanctissime: *Quum sordet tellus, dum caelum aspicio!* tum eo uti solatio, quod *momentaneum et leve tribulationis nostrae aeternum gloriae pondus operatur in nobis*. Enimvero una haec est ratio praesentis temporis cum aeterno, terrestis civitatis cum caelesti apte iungendae; hac una educuntur fortes animi et excelsi. Qui quidem, si magno numero censeantur, dignitas et amplitudo stabit civitatis; florebunt quae vera, quae bona, quae pulchra sunt, ad normam illam expressa quae omnis veritatis, bonitatis, pulcritudinis summum est principium et fons perennis.

Iam videant omnes, quod principio possumus quarum sit utilitatem fecunda marialis Rosarii virtus et quam mirifice possit ad temporum sananda mala, ad gravissima civitatis damna prohibenda. Istam vero virtutem, ut facile cognitu est, illi praecipue uberisque percepturi, erunt qui cooptati in sacra Rosarii Solidaritia, peculiari et inter se fraterna coniunctione et erga sanctissimam Virginem obsequio praeceteris commendatur. Haec enim Sodalitia, auctoritate romanorum Pontificum comprobata, ab eisque donata privilegiis et numeribus indulgentiae, suo palam ordine a magisterio reguntur, conventus statis habent temporibus, praesidiis optimis instruuntur quibus sancte vigeant et ad commoda etiam Societatis humanae conducant. Haec sunt veluti agmina et facies, praelia Christi per sacratissima eius mysteria pugnantes, auspice et duce Regina caelesti: quorum illa supplicationibus, ritibus, pompis



quam adsit prohibitio praeclare omni tempore patuit, magnifice ad Echinadas. Magno igitur studio in talibus Sodalitiis condendis, amplificandis, moderandis par est contendere et eniti, non unos inquitur alumnos Dominici Patris, quamquam illi ex disciplina sua debent summo opere, sed quotquot praeterea sunt animarum curatores, in sacris praesertim aedibus ubi illa iam habentur legitime instituta. Atque etiam Nobis maxime in votis est, ut qui sacras expeditiones ad Christi doctrinam, vel inter barbaras gentes invehendam vel apud excultas confirmandam obeunt, hac item in re elaborent.—Ipsius omnibus hortatoribus, minime dubitamus, quin multi e Christifidelibus animo alacres futuri sint, qui tum eidem Sodalitati dent nomen, tum eximie studeant bona intima, quae exposuimus, assequi, illa nimirum quibus ratio et quodammodo res Rosarii continetur. Ab exemplo autem Sodaliū maior quaedam reverentia et pietas erga ipsum Rosarii cultum ad ceteros manabit fideles: qui ita excitati, ampliores impendent curas ut, quod Nobis desideratissimum est, eorundem salutarium bonorum copiam abunde participant.

Haec nobis igitur praelucet spes, hac ducimur atque in tantis reipublicae damnis valde recreamur: quae ut plena succedat, ipsa exorata efficiat Rosarii inventrix et magistra, Dei et hominum Mater, Maria. Fore autem vestra omnium opera, Venerabiles Fratres, confidimus, ut documenta et vota Nostra ad familiarum prosperitatem, ad pacem populorum et omne bonam eveniant. Interea divinarum munerum auspiciem ac benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis singulis et clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die viii septembris anno mdcccxiii, pontificatus Nostri sextodecimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

THE PIOUS ASSOCIATION OF THE HOLY FAMILY, FOUNDED  
14TH JUNE, 1892, BY HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII.

1. The House of Nazareth is to be the model of every Christian's home—the father finding his model in Joseph, the mother hers in Mary, and the children theirs in Jesus.

2. Colleges and religious houses count as families.

3. Every house to have a picture of the Holy Family, before which the inmates will pray, if possible, each evening, or at least some time during the day.

4. The Leaflets with the prayers to be said, the indulgences to be gained, and the form of consecration, can be got at any Catholic bookseller's.

5. The head of each family or community is to be registered in the parochial register, and the number constituting the family is to be mentioned. Though only the head is registered, the entire family participate as associates in the indulgences.

6. In the parochial register there should be columns for the date of enrolment, the names and addresses of the heads of families, and for the number in the family or community. The parish priest ought to sign the register at the end of each large enrolment, or at least at the end of the year, in the month of March, before sending the number of heads of families enrolled since the last return, to the Diocesan Director. The *tot* of the number of persons in the families may also be sent, if convenient.

7. The families, though usually consecrated altogether in the parish church by the parish priest or his delegate, can consecrate themselves separately, just as religious communities in their homes.

8. The indulgences are to be gained by the associates reciting the prayers appointed by the Pope before a picture of the Holy Family at home or in a church.

9. The heads of families ought to receive a certificate of enrolment from the parish priest, which runs thus: Names of diocese and parish—year, month and day of enrolment—the name of head of family, stating that he with a certain number in his family were enrolled in the "Pious Association of the Holy Family." Then the signature of the parish priest.

10. These certificates could easily be combined with the next edition of leaflets, and be placed at end so as to be conveniently filled up for each head of a family.

*St. Vincent's, Cork.*

M. O'CALLAGHAN, C.M.

THE SPECIAL OFFICE OF ST. ITA IS EXTENDED TO THE  
DIOCESE OF WATERFORD.

WATERFORDIEN.

Rînus Dñus Richardus Sheehan hodiernus Episcopus Waterfordien., votis etiam Cleri sibi commissi libenter obsecundans, Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum Leonem Papam XIII. supplices rogavit ut in festo Beatae Itae Virginis, quae intra eandem Diocesim ortum duxit, pro Officio de Communi huc usque

adhibito, Officium cum Missa proprium, pro Dioeceso Limericiensi approbatum, amodo assumi valeat.

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, utendo facultatibus sibi specialiter ab eodem Sanctissimo Domino Nostri tributis, benigne precibus annuit. Servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 17 Martii, 1893.

✠ CAJ. CARDI. ALOISI-MASELLA, *Prae.*

#### CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

##### DOUBTS REGARDING THE IMPEDIMENT OF AFFINITY.

Caius adhuc in infidelitate vivens fornicarium commercium habet cum femina; deinde facti poenitens et idololatriae renuntians, rite instructus baptizatur. Accepto baptismo, Caius potestne sibi in legitimam uxorem ducere sororem germanam illius feminae cum qua, in infidelitate vivens, peccavit.

R. Affinitatem quae in infidelitate naturaliter contrahitur ex copula tum licita, tum illicita, non esse impedimentum pro matrimoniis quae in infidelitate ineuntur: evadere tamen impedimentum pro matrimoniis quae ineuntur post baptismum, quo suscepto, infideles fiunt subditi Ecclesiae, eiusque proinde legibus subiecti.

## Notices of Books.

FASTI MARIANI; SIVE CALENDARIUM FESTORUM SANCTAE MARIAE VIRGINIS DEIPARAE: MEMORIS HISTORICIS ILLUSTRATUM. Auctore F. G. Holweck, Sacerdote Archidioecesis S. Ludovici Americanae. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Sumptibus Herder. 1892.

By a combination of cause and effect in the orders of grace and nature respectively, no hour (perhaps no minute) of the four and twenty, which mark the revolution of the earth round the sun, is allowed to pass without an Offering being made of the Great Sacrifice of the New Law to Almighty God. Of course, this fact is well known to Catholics, and it is a suggestive one; and it has been observed and tabulated in relation to various

latitudes and longitudes, at different seasons of the year, the wide world round. But the fact is not so well known, and the thoughts aroused are not less well worthy of notice, that probably, no Eucharistic day is permitted to dawn in the yearly cycle of the Church's festivals without such sacrifice offered to the glory of God being made, under some one or more of her almost endless invocations, in honour of God's Immaculate Mother.<sup>1</sup> And it has been reserved for an American secular priest, Father Holweck, in the nineteenth century to recognise, to catalogue, to classify, and to illustrate and annotate this wonderful development in the Church of devotion to Mary. The author's purpose is indicated in the following words: "Hunc mihi proposui finem, ut enumerarem festa SS. Deiparae Mariae, quae in terrarum orbe sive a Catholicis, sive ab haereticis et schismaticis, aguntur et acta sunt, non in exteriori quidem solemnitate, sed in officio liturgico Breviarii et Missae, vel quae commemorantur in calendaris Liturgiis, in Menais, Martyrologiis, et Menologiis cujuscunque generis."

The text of *Festi Mariani* is arranged according—(1) to the days of each successive month in the year; and (2) to the movable festivals in each month, and in most of the seasons severally. It is preceded by a preface, a prolegomena, a list of non-liturgical books quoted or utilised, and a table of contents; and it is followed by an index of the feasts mentioned or described, and an index of names, places, and orders. The whole is contained in a handy volume, in small octavo, of 400 pages, well printed in readable type, though issued in that unpractical foreign form so distressing to students, a paper cover and stitched only with fragile thread. The contents of the volume are collected from nearly, if not from quite, every available source of living authority in the Church, both East and West, of the Old World and of the New alike, and also from sources which have no binding authority upon Catholics. They include, in the first place, historical, antiquarian, or liturgical notes of each festival in turn of our Blessed Lady; and next, as a devotional or ecclesiological commentary, allusions, extracts, or quotations are made from Catholic literature of every age and nearly from every tongue. It is hardly possible even to summarise these references and passages without making an analysis of the whole work. It must suffice

<sup>1</sup> In the *Kalendarium Beatae Mariae*, which forms a part of the *Summa Aurea* (Migne's Edition, 1866), by Father Bourasci, each day in the year is dedicated to some festival of our Lady.



to say that the following, amongst many more, are laid under contribution by the unwearied patience and singular industry of the learned author, and are afterwards tessilated together in a harmonious whole by the hands of a skilled expert: extracts from rubrics and liturgical offices; passages from sermons and works of the fathers; sayings of the saints; quotations from Papal bulls; antiphons, versicles, and responses; hymns, verses, and other poetry; tropes, invitatores, a farsed sanctus, and the rulings of decrees, congregations, local councils, and national ordos and calendars. These details, with a well-digested and orderly mass of references, quotations and dates, are made from such varied sources, as to date, locality, or faith, as the following: from the *Diario Romano*, as the yearly local handbook of festivals at the centre of Christendom; from the office books of the world, from Protestant Sweden or schismatic Russia to Catholic Mexico and Lima; from Coptic, Maronite, or Chaldaic uses to customs of faithless England; from diocesan or conventual Breviaries and Missals; from the time of St. Ephrem the Syrian, in the fourth century, to those of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. in the present age; and from sources in the Greek, Latin, German, Italian, French, English, and other languages.

To give an idea of the range of the contents of Father Holweck's encyclopaediac compilation, it must suffice to quote, with as much brevity as may be possible, the headings of two day's festivals of our Lady, one chosen at hazard from the daily Calendar, and one chosen as a contrast, or by way of comparison, from the Ordo of the seasons. Thus, under July ix., will be found references to these festivals; I. 1. Prodigiorum B. V. M. (commemorating many miraculous movements of images of our Lady in the year 1796), in the Churches of Rome, Albano, Bordeaux, Orleans, Lyons, Chartres, Aix, of America, and of many religious orders, &c.; 2. de Misericordia; 3. Consolatrieis Afflictorum; 4. Dolorosae; 5. de Guadalupe; 6. de Lampade; 7. de Monte Carmelo; 8. in Via; 9. de Miraculis; 10. Immaculatae; 11. Assumptae; 12. Patrocinium; 13. Humilitatis; 14. de Gratia; and also—B. V. M. Reginae Pacis; Coronatio; Chiquinquira (inundatio aquarum); Cordis; Consecratio Ecclesiae ad Fontem; Apparitio Imaginis de Kolocja (Moscow). Under the heading of the first Sunday in the month of May twenty-four festivals are noted, of which the following titles are some: B. V. M. Divini Pastoris Matris; Titulo Tempestatis; Nuncupatae de Succursu; de Bono Consilio; Maternitas; Matris Gratiarum; Coronatio

Sacrae Iconis ; de Victoria ; de Unda ; de Penna ; de Casaluce ; de Scala ; de Constantinopoli ; de Rosario ; de Visito ; de Stella ; de Rupe ; de Bono Successu ; Gratiarum Matris.

It would require research almost as wide as that of Father Holweck to criticize in detail such a compilation. It may suffice to name one or two topics to which, in a second edition, the learned editor's attention may be directed. Father Holweck has printed many hymns, in part or wholly. The volumes of Mone's *Hymni Latini Mœli Arri* contain upwards of six hundred hymns in honour of Mary ; and Daniel's and other collections are rich in Marian poetry. It would add considerably to the value of his pious work, if more use were made of these poetic treasures to illustrate, even from liturgical or other sources not always germane to the point in question, the text of his Calendar. The lists of abbreviations is imperfect. The Index of authors, places, and orders, might be largely increased ; and geographical references might be less sparingly made. Some of the proper names require, from the unlearned, a reference to that most useful book *Orbis Latinus*. The spelling of these names are not invariably at unison in the index and text respectively ; and the books quoted from, or referred to, are not always found in the Bibliographical List ; e. g., Mone's *Hymns*. It is unfortunate that the first edition of Gautier's Poetical Works of Adam of St. Victor (1858) should be quoted, in the place of the second, which represents the editor's wider knowledge and maturer judgment, published some thirty years later. It is hardly fair to suggest a source from which an author may have systematically abstained from quoting ; but, as an English Catholic, it has occurred to the writer that, perhaps, materials might have been found to enrich the present volume, if only in an historical direction, by references to the uses of the ancient or mediæval Church of England. The quaint dedication titles of some of the older churches in London only are suggestive that the feasts of such temples might, under enlarged conditions, have found a suitable record in the *Fæsti Mariani* ; e. g., St. Mary --at the Bowe (from being built on arches) ; Aldermay (the oldest church in London) ; Colchyrehe ; Stanyng (built of stone) ; Wolnore (near the wool-market) ; Abchyrch ; Wulchurch ; Bothawse (boat-builder's yard) ; Gornerceth ; at the Naxe (the axe used in the martyrdom of St. Ursula). [From Arnold's *Chronicle*, A.D. 1521, in Father Bridgett's, C.S.S.R., valuable book *Our Lady's Dowry*.]

In conclusion, a final suggestion may be absolutely made,

without any qualification, viz., that it would tend greatly to edification in a Protestant and missionary country like England, if Father Holweck's valuable and instructive work could be adapted and reproduced in the vernacular by some Catholic house. It is a work which might well be published by such a firm as that of Messrs. Burns & Oates, London. O. S.

SECRET SERVICE UNDER PITT. By W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A.  
London : Longmans, Green and Co.

THE ambit of an ideal historian's survey and the moral aim of his disinterested efforts, are set forth with fervid eloquence but with dangerous elasticity of meaning, in the following words quoted by the veteran author of the above laborious work, from the well-known Rev. Arthur O'Leary :—" The duty of the historian binds him to arraign at the impartial tribunal of truth both men and actions ; unmask the leading characters ; examine into their motives ; lay open the hidden charges of proceedings, whether worthy of applause or deserving to be doomed to censure ; and embellish his narrative with suitable reflections. No person is obliged to write a history, but when he writes it he must tell the truth." No fair-minded man can dispute that it is the duty of an impartial historian to let the full light of day shine upon the clearly ascertained results of his careful researches. His motto should be *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*. Sensibilities may be hurt, but truth has conquered.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's task was a delicate and uninviting one, and his vast labour and care, so far from running the risk of depreciation from the comments we feel reluctantly obliged to place before our readers, are certain to secure their object more effectively in a future edition, if the memory of no man is disparaged beyond the limits of well-established facts and proved charges. Where an allegation is proved by documentary evidence, by all means let the truth be known at any cost, no matter what cause may suffer, no matter whose feelings may be wounded. But " to examine into their motives, to lay open the hidden charges of proceedings " may carry even a well-intentioned writer far beyond the frontier of truth. The suggestion of names and motives to supply for missing links in the chain of a real or imaginary plot may be correct and successful on one or two occasions : but, unless supported by reliable evidence, it is always perilous, and eventually spurns restraint.

It is not the historian's fault that the interest the Irish reader

must take in his book is of the most melancholy kind. In the picture it draws of depraved human nature, "Madam Midas" is left nowhere. In turning over the dark sickening pages, one seeks in vain for any glimmering of sunshine. All is gloomy, horrid, gruesome, a veritable "Scroll written over with lamentation and woe."

John Sheares, no doubt, entertains and expresses noble sentiments; his brother sacrifices everything to his conscientious convictions; the memory of Lord Edward Fitzgerald is as fondly and justly revered as that of any among the most desperate of the old Irish chieftains. But these fair flowers, that even anti-Irish readers of history must admire and approach with feelings of tenderest reverence, are almost unobservable in the rank thicket of spies and traitors that overgrows and surrounds them. It is sad to reflect that such a state of things existed; but it is only a just recognition of Mr. Fitzpatrick's painstaking energies to record our belief that, in most cases, he has tracked and convicted the real debased culprits.

But we would ask any honest reader of this valuable book, has its author dealt with the characters of Dr. Hussey, Dr. Curtis, and others, in a spirit of fairness? The following is the tribute he pays the eloquent and cultured Bishop of Waterford, in describing his success as a preacher in London: and this is only one instance of the "suitable reflections" with which he embellishes his narrative:—"Dr. Hussey had been so long condemned to observe the Carthusian rule of silence, that he seemed, when freed from restraint, like an opened flask of 'Munnin'" (page 283). He is set down as a "secret agent," and his character is painted in the shadiest of colours. For instance, in explaining why O'Leary went to reside near Dr. Hussey in London, he says:—"They are all of them designing knaves," writes Orde, and doubtless, he and his colleagues, acting on the coarse prejudices thus expressed, urged the arrangement on the principle of 'set a thief to catch a thief.'" "The effort it must have cost so polished a person as Dr. Hussey to pursue the course ascribed to him," &c. One would fancy the hostility of Higgins, Burke's warm friendship till death, and the hatred of the English executive should have saved the bishop's memory from such aspersions.

No proof is advanced of the allegation against Dr. Curtis, and no adequate justification of the heading "Priests as Secret Agents."

E. MAGUIRE.



SANCTI THOMÆ AQUINATIS, O.P., DOCTRINA DE COOPERATIONE DEI CUM OMNI NATURA CREATA PRÆSERTIM LIBERA, SEU S. THOMAS PRÆDETERMINATIONIS PHYSICÆ AD OMNEM ACTIONEM CREATAM ADVERSARIUS. RESPONSIO AD R. P. F. A. M. DUMMERMUTH, O.P., PRÆDETERMINATIONIS PHYSICÆ DEFENSOREM. SCRIPSIT VICTOR FRINS, SOCIETATIS JESU SACERDOS. Parisiis, Sumptibus P. Lethielleux, Editoris 10 via dicta "Casette," 10.

It would be difficult to enter into a very detailed criticism of the work of Father Frins without discussing at the same time some of the delicate and difficult questions connected with what is called *prædeterminatio physica*. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the history and scope of this volume. In the year 1881, Father Schneeman, S.J., wrote a work entitled *Controversiarum de Divinæ Gratiæ Libertatisque Concordia Initia et Progressus*. To this Father Dummermuth, O.P., replied, in 1886, in a work entitled:—*St. Thomas et Doctrina Præmotionis Physicæ, seu Responsio ad R. P. Schneeman, S.J.* In this work he claims the authority of St. Thomas against Father Schneeman, and contends from various quotations that the Angelic Doctor teaches the doctrine of *præmotio* and *prædeterminatio physica*. Death prevented Father Schneeman from continuing the controversy; but his place is very worthily taken by Father Frins in the book which we are reviewing. To give an idea of the scope of the work, he contends, in the first place, that Molinism is in no way prejudiced by the Papal Constitutions which are sometimes urged against it; he next explains the state of the controversy between Thomists and Molinists; he contends that St. Thomas both directly and indirectly denies the physical predetermination of the will in the sense in which it is taught by the Thomists; and finally, he maintains that the Thomists have departed from the ancient teaching of their own school, and discusses the origin and cause of what he calls "Neo-Thomism."

These three books are important for persons who wish to study fully and impartially the much-disputed question of *præmotio physica*.

D. C.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

## SOCIALISM, ITS PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS.<sup>1</sup>

THE task of offering a comprehensive view of that movement which is designated by the general term "socialism" is beset with many difficulties. Chief among those is the difficulty of adequately defining the subject-matter which we undertake to discuss. The words "socialism" and "socialist" have been so variously applied, with meanings apparently so incompatible, that it has become difficult to determine for them a sense which would be common to them in all their applications. Bakunin, the most uncompromising of revolutionists, is sometimes described as a socialist; Count Albert de Mun, the most scrupulous advocate of Christian social duty, has been called by the same name. Bebel, to whom the highest achievement of social reform would be the abolition of all religion, is called a socialist; and Cardinal Gibbons, who would regenerate society by renewing its obedience to the Gospel, is not unfrequently described by the same term. We have heard it applied to the chiefs of the International Labour Association; and, if we listen to the organs of certain influential political parties at home, we may at times find it used to qualify the action of some of our own prelates whom we know to have scolded sympathily with extreme revolutionary projects.

<sup>1</sup> A Lecture delivered at the Opening of the *Aula Maxima*, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, October 3rd, 1893.

At first sight one might be led to think there was absolutely no justification for the use of a common appellation in reference to men and movements so widely different in motive and purpose. But if we look more closely into the matter, we shall find that a certain common ground is occupied by these social reformers otherwise so widely opposed; and we may presume that those who class them all in one category, and condemn them by one epithet, are thinking only of what they all more or less agree on, not of the much more numerous points on which they differ.

Looking at the numerous schools into which those who style themselves socialists, or are so reproachfully styled by others, divide themselves, we notice that they all find fault with the existing industrial order, and that they all profess themselves concerned to reform it. This we may regard as the negative aspect of every programme which can be described as socialistic; and it is this aspect, common to social theories so widely opposed as those of Leo XIII. and Karl Marx, which leads the advocates of the existing order to describe both by a common term. When we pass into the region of positive or reconstructive effort; when we ask the reformers how they would deal with the evils which they complain of in the industrial system now prevailing; what they would substitute for that system; and how they would bring about the change, we find them separated at once into distinct and for the most part antagonistic schools.

To review, however briefly and imperfectly, the phases and factors of the socialistic movement—including under that term everything to which the name is currently applied—it will be necessary to notice, first, what I have called the negative aspect of socialism; and then, so far as time permits, to give account of the more important of the forms it takes as a positive or reconstructive movement—by what new forms of society it seeks to replace the old, and by what means it proposes to compass this reconstruction.

We begin with the defects of our existing industrial organization, against which socialism is a protest, and which it strives to cure. These evils we may sum up under the two heads, Individualism and Capitalism. We shall best

explain what evils these terms signify, by referring to the circumstances which called them into being, as characteristic features of the social life of the present century.

Towards the close of the last century, the doctrine was preached in France, and became fashionable among the philosophers and statesmen of Europe, that society is based upon a contract, freely entered into by men, with the purpose of safeguarding their rights; that in society man voluntarily restricts his freedom in order to enjoy it the more securely; that society exists by free choice of the individual, and serves its purpose only in so far as it enables the individual to exercise in fuller measure, and with larger profit to himself, the faculties with which he is endowed. Apart from his own purposes, and his own profit, man owes no obligation to social order, nor to any power higher than himself by whom that order may be prescribed. His own interests are the source and the measure of his duty to his fellow-men.

The complement of this doctrine of selfishness as the basis of social life, was a doctrine of exaggerated individual liberty in the society constituted on this foundation. And this complementary doctrine was emphatically proclaimed and insisted upon in the great political revolution with which the century closed. The declaration of the Rights of Man was the consistent sequel to the theory of the Social Contract, the logical issue of the principles which the economists of France, as well as her philosophers, had been preaching for fifty years.

The workman was amongst those on whom the boon of the new freedom was conferred in largest measure. He was emancipated from all the restrictions to which he had been subject in the industrial order of the old *régime*; the guilds and corporations of handicraftsmen were abolished; the labour of human hands became a subject of free traffic, which the labourer could offer in any market, and to any purchaser to whom he wished to carry it. The labour organizations which were thus swept away had their defects, it must be admitted; and the arbitrary and ill-conceived interference with the national industries which earlier



governments permitted themselves, had been a serious hindrance to the national prosperity. But the radical change introduced by the Revolution was not wholly for good ; the liberty conferred upon the workman was not an unqualified blessing. He was declared free to dispose of his labour as he chose ; but freedom to dispose of his labour did not bring with it any guarantee that he would find some one to accept at its value the labour he was prepared to offer. He entered a market<sup>e</sup> where there were many competitors, where each man stood alone, and where all transactions were conducted in obedience to the laws of supply and demand. In former times the guilds had regulated the labour of their members ; a community of interests, as well as a recognised code of discipline, bound them together ; they took their place in the industrial system as a corporation, in which the strength of the whole was the strength of each individual. Moreover, the workman had to deal immediately and directly with the master craftsman, with a member of his own trade, to whom he was bound by the fellowship of his craft, and by the laws of the guild, to whom he was, in the language of the time, either a *companion* or an apprentice ; and with whom, therefore, he was associated by ties which were, to a large degree, an extension of the family bond. In the new order of things he had to do with an *employer*, with a man who bought his labour from him, at what the accidents of the market made its present exchange value, who took him into his service, and dismissed him, pretty much as he would adopt and discard a machine ; and who, when he had paid the allotted wage for the task executed, acknowledged no further duty in his regard, and took no further interest in his lot. It was liberty on both sides : liberty for the employer to buy as he pleased, and liberty for the labourer to sell ; but it was a liberty which, in the issue, could not fail to bring disaster upon the party who was compelled to sell, on pain of starvation, where there was no corresponding pressure on the purchaser forcing him to buy.

In this way, the principle of unrestricted individual liberty operated in the industrial order ; this was the individualism of which so much has been talked and written.

The first preachers of this doctrine announced it with a fervour begotten of unbounded faith. Their enthusiasm made them blind to its defects. They forgot that individualism means isolation; that to isolate the labourer is to render him helpless; that he is the weakest, though by no means the least important, member of the social body; and that if he is left to himself, he will inevitably be crushed by the greater forces with which he will be brought into conflict.

It happened by a coincidence, which has largely affected the social question, that at the time when individualism was preached as a political doctrine by philosophic statesmen, and enforced by the legislation of the Government which was emerging for the political revolution, causes were at work bringing about other important changes in the industrial order which were destined to intensify and develop the evils inherent in the individualistic economy. The latter half of the eighteenth century witnessed the rise, in gigantic proportions, of that system of production, which the French call *la grande Industrie*, and which, for want of an adequate translation of the French phrase, we call Capitalism. In the older industrial order, the enterprises of manufacture were controlled by a vast number of small manufacturers. The guilds and corporations were local institutions; each master-craftsman was a director of industry; and his workshop an independent centre of production. The needs of the great foreign trade which followed the discovery of the New World, and the establishment of commercial relations with the distant regions of Southern Asia, required that both the production of commodities and their distribution should be carried on on a larger scale; that greater enterprises should be undertaken; that the means of carrying on these enterprises—that is, capital—should be concentrated, placed under the control of fewer hands, and its application directed by a smaller number of highly-skilled experts. Almost simultaneously with the rise of these new conditions of foreign commerce, came the discovery and the introduction into manufacture of the potent machinery which could execute so rapidly the work

which had hitherto employed human fingers and human brains. The capital which had heretofore been dispensed in wages to workmen, could now be profitably invested in machinery: the output of manufactured goods would be increased, not diminished in consequence. Political economists, such as Adam Smith, pointed out the great advantage to capitalists which would result from massing their capital, and carrying on their productive operations on the largest scale possible—the savings in buildings, the savings in wages, of superintendence, and the numberless other gains which would follow the policy of concentration. The owners of capital were alive to their interests. Vast accumulations of capital were effected, joint-stock societies were formed, the business of manufacture was conducted by a small number of skilled managers; and the owners of the capital, if they did not choose to take part in the industry, could sit at home, or amuse themselves abroad, while their dividends were growing.

Meanwhile, how did it fare with the workman? He was now more completely a chattel, the victim of demand and supply, than he had been before. He had no longer to do with the master of a small industry, with an employer who was himself a craftsman, and with whom, apart from any kind of trade fellowship or organization, he could deal as with a creature endowed with human sympathies, and amenable to the instincts of human compassion. He had to do with a trading or manufacturing company, with an impersonal entity, which dealt with him according to the laws of the market in all their rigour, from which he could expect no sympathy, which bought from him the supply of muscular or mental labour which he could furnish, but which took no thought for his needs, and had no concern for his misfortunes.

Soon the great organizations of capital became not merely the purchasers of the workman's labour, but the arbiters of his existence as well. Capital had taken such an important place in the economy of production, that it possessed the power of setting the processes of production in motion or bringing them to a standstill at pleasure. The artisan could

not work unless the wheels of the great machines revolved; and it depended on the owner of the wheels to say whether they should revolve or not. If there was a prospect of gain for the owner they turned, and the workman was paid what his labour was worth; if the prospect of gain for the capitalist ceased, the wheels became stationary, and the workman starved. Again, the constant discoveries which improved and multiplied the mechanisms of manufacture, increased the instability of the workman's position, and not unfrequently added to his hardships. The introduction of a new machine enabled the capitalist to dispense at a stroke with hundreds or thousands of his "hands;" and as the "hands" were to him nothing more than machines which had been superseded by the new discovery, he dismissed them without scruple, and without regret. There might not be any other employment for them, any other resource than starvation or public charity. But that, after all, was a matter which did not concern him. The principle of "natural liberty" left every man to do for himself, as he found it best for his interests; the capitalist had to take the course most profitable to himself; if he did not, he would soon be left behind in the industrial race by less scrupulous competitors.

Furthermore, the abolition of the guilds, and the consequent opening of the trades to everyone who chose to enter, increased at every point the number of the applicants for labour. The capitalist was in a position to make his own terms. The competition for work enabled him to force down the price at which he bought his labour supply; and as the law of demand and supply was the only law he felt called upon to acknowledge, he forced it down as low as the competition would permit him. It was not a question of the intrinsic value to him of the work performed by the labourer; the question was what were the lowest terms which the applicant for work would be forced to accept by the prevailing condition of the labour market.

It is needless to point out that in this condition of things the advantage in the labour contract was for the most part on the side of capital. It could not be otherwise. The gains of the capitalists from the processes of industry grew



extravagantly, without any proportionate improvement in the condition of the workers; huge fortunes were accumulated by investors of capital, and side by side with the luxury and magnificence which these fortunes maintained, the destitution and demoralization of the poor attained vast and appalling proportions.

To this consummation the twin principles of individualism and capitalism had led in due time—this was the result which the political doctrine of unstinted liberty, and that economic policy of unqualified industrial freedom embodied in the celebrated maxim, *laissez faire laissez passer*, brought forth for the labourer whom the statesmen and the economists had undertaken to emancipate. It is against the evils thus produced that socialism in all its forms—salutary or dangerous, Christian or irreligious—protests; and it is these evils it seeks to remedy.

The reign of absolute industrial liberty had hardly been proclaimed when the voice of rebellion was raised against it. Strangely enough, the first malcontents showed themselves in France. At the moment when liberty was declared the inalienable birthright of every man, Babeuf came forward to announce the claims of the poor on the riches of the great—the equal right of all men to the earth and its products. This, however, was an extension of the Rights of Man for which the Directory was not prepared, and the authors of that famous document imposed silence on Babeuf by means of the guillotine. Following Babeuf, Fourier, St. Simon, and Cabet preached the doctrine of the equal rights of men in the matter of temporal possessions. But they worked out their theories in a manner which gave little alarm to the authorities: they set themselves to found communistic societies, which should illustrate the working of their plans for the regeneration of society; and as this policy could only end in failure, and bring ridicule on its authors, there was no reason why the Government should take offence. Governments have nothing to fear from communistic theorists. The plan of giving every man—whatever be his deserts—an equal claim with his fellows on the products of the general labour, is so absurd, so utterly

destructive of all industrial effort, that the good sense of the masses will scotch it, without encouragement from governments. No school which adopts the communistic formula, "From each man, according to his capacity, to each man according to his needs," will meet favour, except among the idle and the dissolute, who willingly live upon the labour of others. But French enthusiasts saw things otherwise in those days.

We are more surprised to find doctrines cognate to those of St. Simon advocated in England by a thoughtful, practical man of business such as Robert Owen. Owen's communism, however, was not the conclusion from lofty principles of human liberty or theoretic abstractions about the rights of man: it was the outcome of human sympathy for those distresses of the poor which the new industrialism had entailed. Robert Owen was the son of a working-man, born in Montgomeryshire, in 1771. By his industry and commercial capacity he rose to be chief owner of the New Lanark Mills, in which fifteen hundred hands were employed. The sufferings of his workers moved his compassion, and in his zeal for their well-being he made them his partners in the ownership of the mills. The success of this scheme of co-operation led him to a study of the labour question as a whole. Unfortunately for his theories, he imitated St. Simon in his rejection of religion, and unfortunately for his good sense he imitated Cabet in his attempt to found communistic communities—one of them in the County Clare. His schemes came to naught, as all such schemes must do, and he died in obscurity and poverty, after a long life of struggle against that industrial system, which he held to be iniquitous and oppressive of the poor.

These efforts of the social reformers of France and England can hardly be regarded as more than a clumsy expression of the discontent which the new conditions of industry could not fail to call forth. Of the same character were the schemes of Bakunin and Proudhon; they were wholly destructive, mere programmes of anarchy, issued as a challenge to the society which the authors held responsible for the hardships of the poor. Bakunin was a Russian,

whose advanced opinions brought about his early exile from Russia, and who spent his life exciting the labour masses of Europe to a war against the existing social order. His *Catechism of Revolution* lays down the principles on which the anarchists of the Old World and the New have since been acting :—

“ The revolutionist [he says] is a consecrated man. He has no personal interests, no feelings, no business, no preferences, no possessions, not even a name. All within him is absorbed by one exclusive purpose, by one thought and passion—revolution. Not in his words and acts merely, but in the very depth of his being, he has separated himself for ever from public order, from the entire civilized world, from the laws, customs, morals, and manners recognised by the world . . . A revolutionist does not take his place in any class of society; he lives in society only in the expectation of its prompt and complete destruction. If any object in the world has value in his eyes, he is no revolutionist. He must not shrink from the destruction of any institution, of any bond of friendship, or of any man who inhabits this earth.”

And so on, through many pages of a lurid gospel of destruction. Proudhon is not so sanguinary in his teachings; but the scope of his social doctrine is the same—anarchy, freedom from all order, from everything that bears the name of law.

These, it will be understood, are not theories which can captivate the minds of the people, or which have any chance of general acceptance. And these, though we notice them, as protests against the existing industrial order, we may pass by without further notice. It was not from England nor from France, nor from Russia, that the socialism came which was destined to establish itself in Europe as a power which defied princes and statesmen, which they could not conquer or conjure, and which they are now seeking to conciliate. Scientific socialism, in all its forms, is of German growth, the creation of the German mind, and established as a power in Europe mainly through German influence.

It has been said that the German student is but a theorist, or as one would say, a dreamer; that his speculations lie remote from the facts of every-day life; that his

practical influence upon the incidents which go to make up contemporary history may be left out of reckoning. Whatever may be urged in favour of this theory, as applied to other departments of social life, it is wholly inapplicable to that with which we are concerned here. From the beginning of the industrial order, which I have called individualistic and capitalistic, thoughtful minds in Germany gave themselves to the study of the new social problems which were growing into prominence. Thünen, Weitling, and Karl Marlo, are known for their bold speculations on the conditions of modern industry, and for the drastic remedies which they proposed for existing economic evils. Rodbertus, son of a Pomeranian gentleman, began fifty years ago the study of the condition of the working classes, and did much to direct the attention of thoughtful students to this question, which now takes precedence of all others. But Rodbertus was a gentleman and a student, his teaching was mere theory; and though he had been a politician in his time, he would make no attempt to reduce his theories to practice in public life. Besides, his teaching was desultory and defective, offering no comprehensive scheme for the cure of the evils which he condemned. It was reserved for a man of different mould and temper to devise and to establish a system of socialism, perfected as a theory, and powerful as an organization, which was destined to unite for a common purpose the vague ambitions and purposeless efforts which his predecessors had called forth. This man was Karl Marx, President of the International Labour Association.

Karl Marx was born at Treves, in the Rhine Province, in the year 1818. He was a Jew by descent, although his parents had renounced the synagogue in order to secure certain temporal advantages not then accessible to persons of Jewish faith. A brilliant career at the bar or in the public service was open to him, but he gave himself to literature. His public criticisms of the Prussian Government drew upon him its inconvenient hostility, and he was obliged to seek refuge abroad. His teachings and his machinations made him a danger to almost every government under which he settled; and at last London was the



only place in Europe in which he could securely carry on the propaganda of the system which he founded. Marx was a man of singular ability, an acute reasoner, with a cogent power of stating arguments and enforcing his conclusions. His great work—the storehouse of the literature of socialism—is his book on *Capital*. The key to the whole system, developed in this remarkable work, is to be found in the author's notion of *surplus-value*. A few words will explain the import of this much-employed term. Competition among the labourers forces them to accept from the capitalist the lowest rate of remuneration compatible with mere subsistence. In other words, the market value of the labourer's day of toil is represented by the sum which will suffice to maintain himself and his family. Thus, if a labourer works twelve hours a day the market value of his toil is represented by the commodities which are necessary to maintain himself and his for the day—that, in fact, is all he receives for labour. But the value of these commodities is created by much less than twelve hours' toil; let us say, by six or by three. In six hours the labourer has done work equivalent in value to all the commodities he consumes—that is, equivalent to the wages paid him; the remaining six hours create surplus value—that is, go to his employer, without remuneration to him. The aim of Marx was to devise a system under which the surplus value should be secured to the toiler. And he could find no other plan adequate to this purpose than to transfer to the democratic state, that is, to the representatives of the labourers themselves, the whole mechanism of production—the land from which all products are derived, and the capital which enables labour to utilize the resources of the land. State ownership of land and capital was, accordingly, the remedy which he prescribed for the evils which oppressed the labouring masses—State ownership, be it noted, in a State strictly democratic, in which the public authorities would be, in the genuine sense, the representatives of the masses.

To compass the social revolution which should permit the introduction of his system, Marx availed himself of the International Workman's Association. It was founded in

1862, and for ten years was controlled and directed in its operations by the guiding mind of Karl Marx. In 1872, at the Congress of La Haye, it broke up into sections, and henceforth the several nationalities represented in it carried on their operations independently. But the doctrines of Marx still remained the doctrines of the divided sections, and the scope of the International remained the scope of its separated parts.

The propagation of the socialistic theories formulated by Karl Marx was rapid and widespread in Germany, chiefly owing to the fact that they were taken up and preached, with extraordinary ardour and extraordinary ability, by an enthusiastic disciple who had the art to make himself an oracle to the working masses. This man was Ferdinand Lasalle; he also a Jew, born in Breslau, in 1825, and killed in a duel at Geneva, in 1864. Of this short life he gave no more than the last three years to the preaching of the socialistic gospel. The rest of his career was devoted to studies of various kinds, or consumed in adventures, at times surprising, and at times scandalous in character. He came before the public as counsel for the Countess Von Hatzfeldt, in a divorce suit against her husband. His eloquence, his enthusiasm, his reckless defiance of all that was respectable and conservative in German society, attracted the attention of the people; and when he took up their case, they listened to his fervid periods as to the words of a saviour of society. In July, 1864, he met the daughter of a Bavarian diplomatist, at the Hotel du Rigi, offered her his hand, and was accepted. But the parents of the lady objected to an alliance with the arch-agitator; and the young lady, disappointed by Lasalle's refusal to elope with her, accepted a husband of their choice. Lasalle challenged his rival, and fell in the duel which ensued. His death was mourned by the working masses of Germany as a national disaster, the homage paid to his remains fell little short of worship, and something like a cult to his memory was created and maintained amongst his followers. At his death the practical policy of Democratic Socialism had been initiated in Germany. The plan had

been adopted of educating the voting masses in the principles of the new economy; of securing by the votes of the masses thus educated a position of power in the legislature, and ultimately, if it might be, the control of the government. This policy has been adhered to and worked out with marvellous persistence. In spite of persecution without, and division and dissension within, the socialist propaganda has gone steadily forward; newspapers have been founded, clubs and societies set up, and great masses of the *Proletariat* won over to democratic socialism. To-day the movement is represented in the Reichstag by forty-four members pledged to its programme. The recent elections show a gain of ten seats upon the elections which preceded. What may be the progress made when another dissolution arrives, it would be impossible to foretell.

The French have borrowed from the Germans the methods as well as the theories of Lasalle; and here the socialists have been able to return their candidates to the Chamber, defeating ministers and ex-ministers at the poll. It is calculated that between socialists pure and simple, and advanced radicals who are ready to support the socialists' demands, the representatives of the extreme doctrines of social reform in the new French Chamber number over one hundred and forty.

Amongst ourselves also democratic socialism is making way. It has absorbed trades unionism, securing for its support the most powerful of our labour organizations and the most popular of the spokesmen of labour. At the recent Trades Congress, held six weeks ago in Belfast, it was resolved by one hundred and thirty-seven votes to ninety-seven, that "Candidates receiving financial assistance must pledge themselves to support the principle of collective ownership and control of all the means of production and distribution, and the labour programme as agreed upon from time to time by the Congress."

Mr. John Burns supported this resolution, as did also a goodly number of those whom we are accustomed to regard as leaders of the labour movement. Mr. Ben Tillet, it is true, prefers to call the system here adopted, Collectivism

rather than Socialism; but this is merely a matter of names. Collective ownership of the sources and means of production, means ownership by the State; and when the State is democratic, as it is in Mr. Tillet's schemes, the system resolves itself into democratic socialism.

I have not attempted any criticism of the doctrines which I have passed in review: it was not within the scope of this address to do so. But without entering into a criticism of socialism as a theory or a practical policy, we may ask ourselves the question: Where is all this movement to end? What is likely to be its ultimate achievement? To this question I would offer as an answer: The movement cannot end in the permanent establishment of socialism. State ownership of land and capital would involve a tyranny which would be worse than the evils it would replace, and which would inevitably provoke a revolution. But in the attempt to assert the supremacy of the socialistic ideal, profound and far-reaching modifications may be introduced into our existing industrial system. A large development of State interference in the processes of industry; an increase of factory legislation; a legal eight hours' day; an increase of State monopolies in various branches of industry; the control by the State, not only of the Post Office, the telegraphs, the railways, but of much of the mechanism of production and distribution besides—all this is possible, and in view of the current tendencies in the industrial world, even probable. Equally probable, and perhaps not wholly to be deprecated is the change which the progress of the movement must introduce into politics. It will give social questions precedence over those that are merely political: it will, in all likelihood, abolish mere party distinctions, and divide politicians rather according to the social interests they represent than according to the colours which they wear, or the men whom they follow. This change will not be wholly for evil; if it does not make politics more picturesque, at least it will make them more rational.

One question more: What part can the Church bear in these movements which are in progress? How can she exert



her mission for good in the vicissitudes of this changing time? To this we may make answer: She can guide the movements which are taking place to ends of holiness and peace, and make herself the light upon the mountain now as in the days of the barbarian invasion. Let me exemplify what I mean. The socialism of Germany is, unfortunately, irreligious and irreverent; not yet boldly anti-religious, because it would be impolitic to profess hostility to the Churches. In Germany, the Church has set herself to control and direct the efforts of the masses towards better conditions of life, and her success proves what power over the elements of social strife she can wield when she wills.

In 1863 Monsignor Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, took up the social question which was then engaging the attention of Germany: it was just a year before the death of Lasalle. In that year he published his work, *The Labour Question and Christianity*. In this work he depicted the evils of the existing industrial system as strongly as Marx and Lasalle, ridiculed as scornfully as they the pretence of liberty which was offered to the workman as a palliation of his distress:—

“Liberty to migrate [says the Bishop contemptuously], when he has not bread where he is born; liberty of contract, when the bargain has to be made between a rich man and a starveling; liberty of trade which draws the products of the country where the workman is badly paid to those where he is better off, and which thus tends to reduce all to the same level of wretchedness! You talk to the workman of self-help, advise him to improve his condition by his own efforts; it is mockery of a man who can hardly make out his daily bread. And now [concludes Monsignor Ketteler, after a scathing denunciation of modern industrialism], we have our slave-market in every country of Europe, modelled upon the plan sketched by an enlightened anti-Christian Liberalism, and our humanitarian freemasonry.”

Monsignor Ketteler called upon the Catholics to unite for the salvation of society and the rescue of the poor. His book became the gospel of a great movement, and his summons called into existence a system of industrial associations which changed the face of Catholic Germany, socially and politically. In 1864, the representatives of the

Catholics of Germany met at Mayence, under the presidency of the Bishop, and formulated their programme of social reform. By the year 1870 the organization was complete. When the *Kulturkampf* began, M. Bismarck had to attack not merely the priests of a Church, but great social organizations with which they were thoroughly identified. The associations were all connected with the Church; they had their religious festivals and their patron saints; they were presided over, not by priests, but by laymen of conspicuous practical ability, and of known fidelity to religion; they included the wealthy inhabitants of each commune, as well as the poor; they were open to the members of every Christian Church, but they rigidly excluded all democratic socialists. In 1870, at the general assembly held at Essen, it was announced that the associations formed under the inspiration of the Church numbered one hundred thousand master-workmen, eighty thousand journeymen, thirty thousand priests, and fifteen thousand small farmers, and it was prophesied that in a few years the associates would be reckoned by the hundred thousand. The prediction has been fulfilled; in 1874 there were two hundred and fifty-eight Catholic newspapers in Germany, most of them organs of the associations; one hundred and fifty in Prussia, seventy-seven in Bavaria, and forty-one in the rest of Germany.

These Catholic associations reach to every form of industry. We have the Catholic Miners' Association, the Association of Labourers, the Artisan's Association, societies for women workers and domestic servants; but, above all, the Farmers' Unions, with their newspapers, their banks, their co-operative purchase system, and their vast network of affiliated societies all over the empire. All this has been due to the inspiration and guidance of the Church; and with this movement, during its progress, the representatives of the Church have been prominently and effectively identified.

Is it surprising that in a country where the representatives of the Church have displayed this beneficent public activity on behalf of the suffering and the poor, her hold upon the allegiance of the people has been strong

enough to defy the attacks of the most powerful, as well as the most astute statesman of the age? Is it wonderful that the Catholic body has been able to return to the Reichstag the most powerful party in that assembly; and that this party has defeated, in the field of politics, the united forces of Radicalism and Liberalism combined for the overthrow of Catholicism? Is it surprising that the socialist propaganda is wholly without result in the areas over which the Church has extended this social activity of hers; that the leaders of Democratic Socialism are fain to confess their powerlessness where she has taken up the work of social reform?

There is a moral in the chapter of contemporary history which we have been reviewing—one worthy of our best attention. It is, that the Church has not lost the secret of her influence with the passing changes in the industrial world; and that where she chooses to intervene in the conflict of classes and interests on behalf of the poor, who have been confided to her by her Founder, she can still assert herself as of old; that the queenship of the nations is still within her reach, wherever she desires to grasp the crown.

THOMAS A. FINLAY, S.J.

## SOME OF OUR MARTYRS.

FATHERS RANDAL MACDOWELL, AND DOMINIC EGAN, O.P.

**M**OST, if not all, readers of the I. E. RECORD are aware that the cause of the beatification of the Irish martyrs is now happily begun. The first preparatory steps were taken a few years ago, when a diligent search was commenced on all sides for such manuscripts and printed books relating to the penal times as contained the history of those heroic children of St. Patrick. The names of nearly all the printed works may be seen in the very interesting articles entitled, "Our Martyrs,"<sup>1</sup> where the Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J., Procurator

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, vol. xiii., 1892, pages 42, 125, 350, 720.

of the cause, enumerated the chief sources of information on his subject. The list of manuscripts will be published later on when all have been collected. Meanwhile it is gratifying to know that some have come to light, which but for the present search might never have been discovered.<sup>1</sup>

When this stage had been reached, that is, as soon as sufficient evidence to begin with had been procured, and the various officials had been appointed, then early in 1892, his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin commenced the preliminary investigation in the cause of beatification. Several witnesses have already been examined, but their depositions given on oath are of course inviolable, and will ever remain in the strictest secrecy. A "revelatio," even on their part, would be punished most severely. But what is not the testimony of a witness, nor connected with it does not fall under the "sigillum;" for instance, the statements of other persons to be found in print or in private manuscripts or in papers preserved in a Record Office, and more or less accessible to everyone. All that is said here is taken only from such sources, namely, the *Hibernia Dominicana* of Dr. Burke, a few old

<sup>1</sup> Here, in the first place, the writer would observe, in conformity with the Decree of Urban VIII., that in designating as "martyrs" those of whom he proposes to treat, he must be understood to do so solely on account of the unanimous consent of historians, the local traditions of Ireland, and the authentic records of his own order, &c., in which these servants of God are so called. But in no sense does he anticipate or wish to anticipate, the infallible judgment of the Church to which exclusively belongs the power to confer the glorious title of martyr. Hence he feels justified in thus using for his present purpose, proofs of the various kinds mentioned above, since for it they are unquestionably sufficient; while, on the other hand, he knows and fully acknowledges that the statements they contain have not the seal of public ecclesiastical authority. Everyone would protest with Dr. Burke, in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, page 588: "nec velle me, aut cultum aut venerationem aliquam per has meas narrationes ulli arrogare, vel funum obprobrium sanctis aut martyribus inducere seu augere, nec quicquam ejus existimationi adjungere, nullumque gradum ferre ad beatificationem vel canonizationem aut miraculi comprobationem, sed cuncta in eo a me relinqui statu, quem sanctus hucusque fuerit et habere, nec obstat quicunque longissimi temporis cursu." At the same time we cannot but rejoice, because what our forefathers so ardently desired, and Irish ecclesiastical historians—as Burke, Rottier, Bruce, and others—worked so well for, it has been granted us to behold. That the day may soon come when the approbation will be given when we shall see those whose cause is now being introduced raised to the altars of the Church, is the hope and prayer of all.



manuscripts, some of which he apparently never saw, and two legal documents which it would have been impossible for him or any other Catholic of his time to inspect. These will be reproduced in full. Their text is most valuable and interesting, and many readers will, it is thought, be glad to see it, and to be thus enabled to judge for themselves of the nature of the collateral evidence at present available for a few of the Irish martyrs.

Of the number now before the Archbishop's court (two hundred and seventy-six, to whom others will presumably be added in course of time), a very large proportion, viz., one hundred and thirteen, belong to the Dominican Order. The present total may seem a surprisingly small one, when we call to mind the statements regarding our forefathers, which are made in contemporary narratives, and repeated in well-known works, such as Cardinal Moran's *Persecutions of the Irish Catholics*, &c. There is, indeed, every reason to believe that the multitude of Ireland's saintly sons who died for the faith should be reckoned not by hundreds but by thousands. In the reign of Henry VIII., and still more under that of Elizabeth, Ireland had her martyrs, many and glorious; yet all this pales before the splendour that succeeded. During the period of Cromwell's savage cruelty, and the years that followed it, Ireland literally filled heaven with her white robed children. In what other land can the Catholic Church point to such a record? What nation has a history comparable to ours? Ever the Island of Saints, Ireland then became the Island of Martyrs. Other countries may have their rolls of famous men, and their chronicles of great worldly events, but none can dispute Ireland's right to wear this double crown. She has the priceless privilege of proclaiming that she alone among the nations received the Gospel with unstained hands; her peerless intellect, and warm heart, filled with rarest grace, at once received Divine truth, and welcomed those who brought from heaven the tidings of peace. The virgin soil of the Emerald Isle was not reddened when Palladius, and then Patrick, came. It was the alien that first saturated it with martyrs' blood. And when he did so from sea to sea, when generation after

generation, all the powers of darkness were leagued against her, then the virtues that her great apostle had instilled shone forth brighter than ever. Ireland stands foremost among the nations also in her fidelity to the faith; that fidelity, like gold thrice tried, has been through centuries of unrelenting persecution put to the test, and that faith has come out of the conflict victorious.

Of general statements, worthy of the highest credit about people to whom religion was dearer than all else, there is indeed no lack. But these regard a nation's woes and the whole of destruction of life. When we descend to particulars, in how few instances, comparatively speaking, do we find still extant well-authenticated and detailed accounts of the martyrdoms of individuals, or of certain numbers of individuals, such as could be accepted as evidence by an ecclesiastical tribunal? As Cardinal Moran says:—

“Unfortunately, however, we have no regular acts of our martyrs, nor useful histories of the unexampled sufferings which they had to undergo during the three centuries of persecution and peril laws through which our country has passed. Our forefathers acted like true servants of Christ, and preserved the faith, covering their country and religion with glory, and securing for themselves an imperishable crown; but the circumstances of the country were so deplorable, and war was carried on so actively against religion, that few written records could be kept, and the glorious achievements of so many Christian heroes were preserved only in the memory of the faithful. As an instance of the difficulty of preserving documents, it may be mentioned that the martyred Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Plunket, in a letter to Rome, states that on a certain emergency, when an outbreak of persecution was feared in Armagh, he had to burn all his foreign letters, even the brief of his consecration.”

Hence the official list drawn up after long and careful research contains at present for the most part only the names of bishops, priests, noblemen, and others whose position in life distinguished them, or the circumstances of whose deaths were so remarkable that they were spoken of through the length and breadth of the land, and evermore cherished with special veneration. When we ask ourselves why does the history of our country not furnish more names at first sight, the answer is, that in the penal days suffering

was so usual that it caused no surprise, and so general that there were none but the sufferers to record it. If Ireland had not quite so many martyrs, more names might have reached us. During the long dark period of persecution, even if men tried to chronicle all the fearful sights they witnessed, at certain times this would have been impossible, and still more so that their narratives could have been penned and safely preserved at home. Hence nearly all the historical works on the subject which contain circumstantial descriptions of individual cases were written or published by the Irish refugees on the Continent; they all agree in the tale of general persecution; while the particular value which any one of them will be found to possess is owing either to reminiscences of the author's early life at home, or to information directly supplied for his work, often by the Irish students and soldiers abroad. Those of Bruodin, O.S.F., and O'Daly, O.P. (Dominic of the Rosary), both so invaluable now in the process, with that of O'Sullivan Beare, may be mentioned here as instances. We could not expect to find everything in books of this kind; indeed the wonder is, that, notwithstanding such disadvantages, so much history has been preserved. Let it not be supposed however that we are indebted only to such as these. At home, too, in spite of every obstacle, far more than could have been expected has been saved by Rothe, Lynch, Burke, and others. Thus concerning some martyrs most valuable information is extant. Many similar accounts of others may have been written during exceptional intervals, but so far as we know at present, so far as researches now being made with the greatest care extend, it is with these works as with the countless shrines, churches, and cloisters that once covered our native land: a few remain; here and there vestiges of some others may still be seen, but of the most "*perierunt etiam ruinae.*" It must be remembered that in Ireland the cruelty of persecutors knew neither method nor bounds; if it ever was satiated, it was so, only by a recklessness and a contempt of every feeling of humanity which baffles description. No pen could depict it, or keep an account of its crimes. The mind recoils at the thought of wantonness.

For the greater portion of the penal times there was no law but the sword, and the country was deluged with the blood of its victims. That was no time for writing history.

What is true of the Church in Ireland in general, will be better realized if we now confine our attention to the history of a portion; to that, namely, of the Dominican Order in this country. Though the Irish Province suffered severely under Queen Elizabeth, yet the only definite accounts apparently extant, if we except that of the martyrdom of two priests and seven novices, in company with forty-two Benedictines and Cistercians,<sup>1</sup> regard but two houses, Derry and Coleraine. In the former thirty-two religious were slain in one night, and about the same time the whole community of twenty-five in the latter. Only one escaped from Derry, a Father John Mac Quillin, and to him we are indebted for our knowledge of these events. He too suffered for the faith; soon after the death of his brethren he was apprehended, fine and scourge of his wearing his habit, and ministering as a priest. Two or three times a week he was tortured on the rack. On one occasion while his body was thus violently stretched out, his jailors with fiendish cruelty let him suddenly fall, and fracture of the spine was the result. This confessor of the faith, however, continued his missionary labours, and lived till 1637. Father Mac Quillin's narrative, handed down by a Father Patrick O'Derry (who was when the two communities had been replaced subsequently at various times Prior in both Coleraine and Derry) and by his own niece has been preserved for us by a Father Michael Mac Quillin, apparently of the same family, who wrote at Rouen, in 1706. There is not in his MS.<sup>2</sup> a single remark which would indicate that the double massacre was considered extraordinary in those days; it is simply set down without a word of comment in the brief chronicle of these houses; and this very circumstance, this eloquence of silence, gives us a truer idea of the times of Queen Elizabeth than any mere rhetorical description could convey. *Then,*

<sup>1</sup> O'Heyne, *Epilogus Chronologicus*, page 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Archives of the General of the Order*, Coll. *Annal.*, E. 655-8.



though we find it repeatedly stated that there were one thousand Irish Dominicans when she ascended the throne, it does not surprise us to find in another MS.<sup>1</sup> that there were only four Dominicans in all Ireland a year before her death; nor to read in another, written in 1729,<sup>2</sup> that the Irish province was at least four times almost annihilated by persecution: *first*, under Elizabeth, "Tum omnes Fratres conventus Culraniensis una nocte trucidati sunt, quod pluribus Fratribus per Hiberniam contigit" (there were then forty-three Dominican houses in Ireland); *second*, under James I., at the end of whose reign there were again only four Dominicans in Ireland, all living under the protection of Lord Clanrickarde near Athenry (at Brosk, not far from Esker), one of them the saintly Father Roche MacGeoghegan, subsequently Bishop of Kildare, being Provincial (1622-6); *third*, under Charles II. (Titus Oates' plot), when, as the author of the MS. says: "Memini in hac saevissima persecutione nos convenire in cavernis aut sylvis (ab omni habitaculo procul) pro missa post mediam noctem furtim audienda, ut singuli ante diem ad suas se retraherent aedes; idque per triennium. Ecclesiastici ut vaccarum custodes de die excurrebant, nocturna munia occulte peragentes;" *fourth*, under William of Orange, by the general banishment of Regulars in 1698. At all these epochs there were some martyrs. This MS., appears from intrinsic evidence to be written by the same Father Edmund Burke (born 1655, professed 1683,<sup>3</sup> who was a boy at the time of the Titus Oates' plot. It is remarkable that he does not refer to the Cromwellian persecution, the severest of all, in which so many Dominicans gained as we hope the martyrs' crown. The names of more than thirty belonging to the period of the Commonwealth are lodged in the Archbishop's court. It is evident that in the intervals of comparative quiet, heroic efforts were made to fill up the vacant places; that, as soon as

<sup>1</sup> *Brevis notitia Provinciae Hib. ab anno 1600-1736 a Rev. Patre Edmundo Burke (Archives of St. Clement's, Rome).*

<sup>2</sup> *Archives of the General of the Order, Coll. Annal., P.P. 389*

<sup>3</sup> *Vid. Hb. Dominicana, p. 548.*

the foremost fell, other soldiers of Christ stepped into the breach. Thus, a fourth and last MS. "Brevis Relatio," &c.<sup>1</sup> states that in 1646 there were six hundred Dominicans in Ireland just before the Cromwellian or Puritan persecution, though there were less than one hundred and fifty when this reign of terror was over :—

"Ex conventibus quadraginta tribus quos Ordo possedit, omnes fuerunt diruti aut flammis combusti præter paucos quos Hæretici sibi conservarunt, ita quod et sexcentis Fratribus quos habuit Provincia Hibernia ad annum 1646 quarto pars hodie non superest, et hi qui residui sunt ex hinc et inde peregrinantur, in continuo morere et tristitia consumuntur, quod eis non pateat via, aut aditus ad carissimam Patriam pro solatio Catholicorum et fidei conservando, quævis enim desint qui inter tot pericula redierunt et alii qui parati sunt redire nacti quæcumque furtiva occasione; alii in cruce acti, alii gladiis occisi et diversis tormentorum generibus martyrium compleverunt, quorum plenorem notitiam expectamus."

And so, in the century that followed, many laid down their lives for Christ ; till at length we reach the close of the penal times, when so-called legal proceedings seemed to have been more frequently resorted to. It was deemed advisable then to make a semblance of justice. This very hypocrisy, however, turns out now to be of considerable assistance in the preparation of the evidence for the Congregation of Rites. Thus does God defeat the wiles of men, and turn all things to the good of those who love Him. As will be seen in this article, the Procurator can quote for two, almost the last on the list, the testimony of their persecutors themselves.

While most of the English martyrs, at whose beatification we rejoice, fortunately had the advantage, as it now appears, of being submitted to a judicial investigation, of which full and accurate records were kept on both sides, most of those who suffered for the faith in Ireland were summarily executed in crowds by martial law, or, when discovered, were slain on the spot. Thus, in many cases, almost all we can bring forward for the Dominicans, is a brief notice of the

<sup>1</sup> *Archives of the General of the Order, Coll. Ann., N. 958-9.*

death in the Acts of our General Chapters. But when we reach what may be called "the period of clemency," a new factor appears, the official statement preserved in the archives of our law courts attesting that, in this individual case, the sole offence was the being a regular priest. Does it not seem that there is here the explicit avowal of *odium fidei*? We do not anticipate the final decision, whatever it may be; but we think that concurrent testimony of this kind will have a special interest for our readers; and, therefore, passing by several of the Irish martyrs, some account of whom may soon appear in these pages, we come to those two whose names stand at the head of this article.

Father Randal Felix MacDowell belonged to St. Patrick's Priory, Tulsk, Co. Roscommon, which was founded in 1448 by the good old family of which he was a worthy scion. There is at present scarcely a vestige of the ancient Dominican house remaining, and few persons are acquainted even with the history of the spot where it stood; but of Father Felix it may be said that "the memory of him shall not depart away, and his name shall be in request from generation to generation." He died for the faith in Newgate Prison, Dublin. As is well known, the Church has in all ages regarded as martyrs those who so laid down their lives; thus, for example, the Roman Martyrology contains the names of many such witnesses to divine truth, "*in carcere*," "*in vinculis*," &c.; or to mention another instance, which is if possible even more apposite, among the English martyrs, *eight* of the Carthusians (the Blessed William Greenwood, Blessed John Davy, &c.) breathed their last, not at Tyburn, but within the walls of Newgate, London.

The Dominican's career was a chequered one, so a brief sketch of its chief events will afford a glimpse at the vicissitudes of a priest's life in the penal times. We may be sure that it is a fair sample of what a devoted clergy experienced for centuries: dangers and difficulties on many sides, still the faith living on and triumphing over every obstacle. If here we may never adequately know the deeds of many of our predecessors in the ministry, it is at any rate an advantage to

be able to form an idea of what kind of men they were. "*Ecce uno discite omnes.*" It was well-nigh impossible for any aspirant to the priesthood to be educated at home, hence Irish students were to be found in great numbers only on the Continent. The Dominicans generally went to Spain. Father Felix studied at Valladolid, and must have distinguished himself, for he was subsequently appointed to the chair of Philosophy in a house of his Order in Sardinia. After spending some time there in the discharge of his professorial duties, he was summoned to Rome, and was one of the seven Irish Dominicans present on the 20th of August, 1647, when Father John O'Connor in the name of their province took possession of St. Sixt's and St. Clement's. These churches with their respective houses were at the time united into one priory, designed to supply Dominican priests for the Irish mission. They were given by the General of the Order, Antonio de Monroy, and the grant was confirmed by Clement IX. and Clement X.

St. Sixt's, on the Appian Way, is one of the most venerated sanctuaries of the whole Order ever since it was hallowed by the presence of the great patriarch St. Dominic. Everything in it is consecrated to his memory. Here he lived for a long time during his stay in the Eternal City; here also some of the most beautiful events in his life took place, and some of his greatest miracles were worked. The other house, St. Clement's, is too well known to all who have visited Rome to need further mention. As a pledge of Heaven's blessing on the future work of the priory dedicated to the martyr Pope, it was fitting that one of the first Irish religious to enter its ancient walls should be predestined to receive a martyr's palm. Meanwhile he was to prepare others for the work of gaining souls to Christ. Immediately after his arrival, as it would seem, he was appointed to teach theology to the Dominican students of the English province in the neighbouring Priory of SS. John and Paul's. This establishment had been obtained a short time previously from Clement X. by Cardinal Howard, O.P., for his English brethren. They continued to reside there till 1697; it then passed into the hands of the Vincentians, and at present it



belongs to the Passionists, the relics of whose great founder, St. Paul of the Cross, repose in the adjoining church. We may be sure that those educated in its lecture hall for the English mission by Father Felix imbibed a martyr's spirit.

In 1680 he was made Prior of St. Clement's, where, as we read, "his holiness and fervour greatly promoted regular observance." So passed his days divided between prayer and study in his peaceful home in the Eternal City, till at length he was selected by his superiors for a scene of active labour, and returned to Ireland after an absence of many years. He came in the capacity of Missionary Apostolic. In 1689 he was appointed chaplain to a regiment in the army of the ill-fated James II., and if he remained so to the end, probably was present at the battle of the Boyne. "*Sacellanus legionis Dychemorum*," says O'Heyne<sup>1</sup>—whatever "*Dychemorum*" may mean.<sup>2</sup> In the MS. Army List of James II., preserved in Trinity College, Dublin, the names of the chaplains are not given. In Dalton's edition of King James's Army List there is no McDowell among the chaplains; but in two places it is stated that the Rev. — McDonnell was chaplain to Henry Luttrell's regiment of horse. Perhaps it should be Rev. — McDowell. Certainly the name of the chaplain of Luttrell's regiment as written in Comte d'Avaux the French Ambassador's list (Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 9763), according to a friend who is competent to judge, may be read, "McDonnell" or "McDowell." Then we should add that the spelling in the list (which is in French) can hardly be relied on to decide the point, for in it we find such pardonable inaccuracies as Calanane, &c. On the other hand, the writer of these lines half suspects that O'Heyne's "*Dychemorum*" is only a word from the Greek (*δυο χατα*), and if so, that it means "foot-soldiers." But in the above-mentioned list among the names of the chaplain of the infantry regiments, there is not one even resembling "McDowell." The question regarding the particular

<sup>1</sup> *Epileptus Chronologus Prior, Hiberniae Ord. Praed. Lorani*, 1706.

<sup>2</sup> Only two copies of this work are known to exist: they are respectively in St. Mary's, Tallaght, and in the West Convent, Galway (Dominican houses).

chaplaincy cannot be solved at present ; but happily it is of little or no importance. Rather we must regard it as fortunate that the *fact* of the chaplaincy did not transpire when Father Mac Dowell was examined before the Court of Queen's Bench, in 1706: it might now perhaps create a difficulty, because it might be thought that he was condemned for political reasons, and not on account of his religion.

After the defeat of James II. Father Felix went abroad ; then, after many wanderings, settled down for a time in England. At length, as did so many others, he turned his weary steps towards home, crossed the Channel, but had barely reached Dublin when, on account of his being a regular priest, he was thrown into prison, where he died a martyr's death, February 3rd, 1707.

Such is the narrative as it appears in the *Hibernia Dominicana*, to which we will now add the following particulars taken from the MS. " Brevis Notitia," &c., mentioned above.<sup>1</sup> In 1699 (*presumably*) Father Felix was taken prisoner at Ballinor, denuded to a horse's tail, and made walk forty miles to Dublin. The present writer is unable to identify the place with certainty. The Ballinore in Co. Westmeath, and the Ballinore in Co. Longford, which topographically seem to have the best claims, are each fifty Irish or sixty-four English miles from the metropolis, while the town of the same name in the Co. Roscommon is seventy-eight Irish or one hundred English miles, even if we measure in a straight line, and not by road. Ballymore-Eustace in Co. Kildare, though not thirty English miles distant, is

<sup>1</sup> " Libus tunc et (Patri) Ambrosio O'Conaore, nouit recepti sunt in Concilio priores ad translationem et electionem ipsorum patrum expectati, ne Ordo Hibernicus in pace permaneret, sed ibidem legitur: Ballinore, ex quo: ex quibus P. Dominicus, Eusebii Francisci in Monasterio, captus. Deinde, post annos novem in carcere obiit; P. Presbyterus Pater Mc Doy, Franciscus, captus prius Ballinore, et ab eodem carcere ad Dubliniam ad 10 millia ductus, exivit rube, et in Angliam fugit, ubi eius favore Lex ad Hispaniam (cujus capellanum egit) bis exulari pro favore obtinuit; sed in Hiberniam redux Anno 1706, captus rube in ipso portu Dublinensi ex interrogatus qui esset, illem respondit: " Dominus meus, Patri de hoc modo vultis, quia me i non veron." Unde ad carcerem de Blacklog ductus, ibidem ad mortem detentus est."

probably the spot indicated. Here we may suppose that soon after the battle of the Boyne, the Williamite soldiers in pursuit of the fugitives came up with the Jacobite chaplain, and continuing their search for a time, brought him by a circuitous route back to Dublin. He subsequently escaped to England, but was arrested there: however, he was liberated through the influence of the Spanish ambassador, whose chaplain he had been, and, as a favour, was suffered to go into exile a second time; in other words, to betake himself to the Continent.

Don Pedro Ronquillo, Count of Granedo,<sup>1</sup> was the Spanish ambassador in England from 1690 to 1693, when he was succeeded by the Marquis of Canales, who remained in office till 1700, when diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off on account of the disputes ensuing on the Treaty of the Hague, and were not resumed until 1713. The Dominican must have been chaplain to one at least of these ambassadors. We cannot guess how Father Mac Dowell was discovered in England, nor the precise cause of his arrest there, but he was probably recognised as one who had escaped from Dublin. The *Hibernia Dominicana* states that he left Ireland on the accession of William of Orange, or soon after;<sup>2</sup> then the circumstances of his first arrest certainly have a military rather than a legal appearance, even as the law was administered in those days. And he himself stated in his examination, *vid. infra*, that he “went from this kingdom about the year ninety-one.” After his forced departure from England, he remained abroad for a time, and was then recalled by the Irish Provincial, Father Ambrose O’Connor (held office 1700-1709), who feared the extinction of his province, and the consequent loss of instruction, deprivation of the sacraments, &c., which the faithful would have to suffer at a time when there was comparatively few priests in the country. As the reader already knows, Father Mac Dowell returned to Dublin, and was at once thrown into prison—the MS. gives the date 1706,

<sup>1</sup> *García y Salcedo. Teatro Universal de España*, chap. viii., pp. 124, 125.

<sup>2</sup> “Deiecto autem regno Anno 1691 transiretavit.”

and the place the "Blackdog," a part of Newgate. Here the holy priest remained till death.

This was the extent of our knowledge regarding the manner of his martyrdom, till recently in the Public Record Office, Ireland, the legal documents of his indictment were providentially brought to light. All were discovered among the dusty bundles of indictments that appeared never to have been looked into since the Clerk of the Court tied them up in the reign of Queen Anne. They have no index, nor is there a clue of any kind to their contents except that those of each term are separate. In general they are of little utility and less interest, being the dismal records of offences, great and small, committed in Dublin from 1702 to 1714; but these belonging to the Dominican martyr are of priceless worth.

INDICTMENTS. (CROWN OFFICE.) QUEEN'S BENCH, 1706. EASTER TERM. NO. 25.

<sup>1</sup> *Cognovit Indictamentum. To be transported.*

Comitatus Civitatis Dublinensis, scilicet, Jurati pro domina Regina super sacramentum suum dicunt et præsentant quod Randal alias Felix Dowell nuper de Dublino in comitatu civitatis Dublini existens sacerdos Regularis ordinis Sancti Dominici et Ecclesiæ Romanæ decimo nono die Aprilis anno regni domine nostræ Annæ dei gratia Angliæ, Scotiæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Reginæ, fidei defensoris æ quinto vi et armis videlicet gladiis, baculis æ in hoc regnum huc inde videlicet apud Dublinum in parochia sancti Michaelis Archangeli in ward Sancti Michaelis in comitatu civitatis Dublini prædicto venit et adhuc remanet ipso eadem Randal alias Felix Dowell tunc et adhuc existente sacerdote Regulari ordinis Sancti Dominici et Ecclesiæ Romanæ in malum et perniciosum exemplum aliorum in tali casu delinquentium et contra pacem dictæ domine Reginæ coronam et dignitatem suam et contra bonam statuti in hujusmodi casu editi et prævisi.

Peruse the annexed examination for proove of this bill.

Tempore Paschali quinti anni æ Comitatus Civitatis Dublini.

Billa vera cum sociis,

JAMES BARLOW.

<sup>1</sup> At the present day it would be somewhat in this form:—

He pleaded guilty. *To be transported.*

County of the city of Dublin, to wit—The jurors for our lady the Queen, upon their oath say and present that Randal, *alias* Felix Dowell, lately of Dublin in the county of the city of Dublin, a regular priest of



The examination of William Rowan, of Rings End, Surveyor, who being sworn saith :—

That upon fryday, the 19 instant Aprill, this Exam<sup>t</sup> being on duty on board the Charlott yatch, Captain George Breholt, Comander, which then arrived in this port of Dublin (as the Cap<sup>t</sup> said) from Chester, this Exam<sup>t</sup> then found a man on board the s<sup>d</sup> ship who called himself Randall Dowell, & the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell being very solicitous to get leave to go on Shoar from the s<sup>d</sup> ship with his cloak, bagg, and Leather Portmant in another Boat than which this Exam<sup>t</sup> intended to carry the Passengers things, which gave this Exam<sup>t</sup> cause to suspect the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell for being an officer from France, or some Popish Bishop or Fryer or Preist, & thereupon this Exam<sup>t</sup> ordered the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell's cloak, bagg, and Portmant into the Queen's Boat, and examining the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell in the presence of severall gentlemen who were then on board, the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell at first declared he came from London \* \* \* and is by trade a cabinet maker, but this Exam<sup>t</sup> suspecting the truth of what he said of himself offered to search him the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell who seemed unwilling to be searcht and resisted, but being compelled to submitt, & this Exam<sup>t</sup> found in his the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell's Letter Case severall papers which shewed the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell's name to be Phelix, & denoted him to be a Popish Preist or Fryar, & then the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell declared he was a Preist, then this Exam<sup>t</sup> sent the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell in custody of Peter Vavesor and James Bradley, Tide waiter and Supernumerary, to the Secretary of State or next Justice of the Peace together with the s<sup>d</sup> papers, and understands they carryed the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell and his papers to Alderman Quin, who comitted him to prison, and there this Examinant saw him since, & saith the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell being this day brought before the judges of the Queen's Bench confessed in open court he the s<sup>d</sup> Dowell is a Dominican Fryer.

Juratum coram me

WILLIAM ROWAN.

April 24<sup>o</sup>, 1706,

THOMAS QUIN,

Comitatus Civitatis Dublini.

the Order of Saint Dominic and of the Roman Church, on the nineteenth day of April, in the fifth year of the reign of our lady, Anne, Queen, by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c., came with swords, staves, and so forth, into this Kingdom of Ireland, viz., in Dublin, in the parish of Saint Michael the Archangel, in the ward of Saint Michael, in the county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, and still remains there; he, the said Randal, *alias* Felix Dowell, being then and now a regular priest of the Order of Saint Dominic and of the Roman Church, to the evil example of others in the like cause offending, and against the peace of our said lady the Queen, her crown and dignity, and against the form of the Statute in such case made and provided.

Peruse the annexed examination for proof of this bill.

Easter Term, fifth year, &c. County of the City of Dublin.

A truebill.

JAMES BARLOW, for Self and Fellows.

The Examinon of Peter Vavesor, of Ring's End, Custome house officer, who being sworn saith :—

That this day there came into the Bay of Dublin the Charlett Yacht. Among other passengers there was a man who appeared to be a Popish Priest and confesses himself to be of the Dominican Order, and calls himself Randall Dowell who pretends to come here for his health, and has divers papers found about him by which he seems to be a Popish Missionary, as whose coming here his Examinant understands there is a late Act of Parliament made, & therefore the s<sup>t</sup> Randall Dowell is brought to Justice.

P. VAVESOR,  
JAMES BRADLY, &  
PETER VAVESOR, Recognoverunt 20£. each.

Juratum coram me

April 19<sup>o</sup>, 1706,

THOMAS QUIN,

Comitatus Civitatis Dublini.

The Examination of Randall, *als* Felix Dowell, who saith :—

That he is a native of this Kingdom of Ireland, was educated at Valladolid in Spain, was ordained in this City of Dublin a Priest of the Dominican Order, between thirty and forty years since, that he went from this Kingdom about the year ninety-one, & has since been travelling in England and Holland, & came into England about three years since and dwelt there ever since, lodging in several places in London, & last at the house of one Mr. Deao, a confessor live in Queen's Street, near Holburn, at the sign of the Cross, but being indisposed in health for half a year past was advised by some eminent Physicians in London to return to his own Native country for the recovery of his health, & saith he came over here from Ches<sup>r</sup> in the ship called the Charlett yacht, Captain Breholt Comander, & was this day seized because it appears he is one of the Romish Clergy.

*Randell als Felix  
Dowell*

Capta coram me

April 19<sup>o</sup> 1706.

THOMAS QUIN.

Then amidst the Queen's Bench Indictments of Hilary Term, 1706, there is the Newgate Prison Calendar, or return

of those confined within its gloomy walls, which was signed on January 23rd, by John Morrison, Jailer. The year began on March 25th, so that Father Felix was then nine months in prison. The Calendar shows in what company the accomplished theologian was condemned to end his days, for opposite each name, or group of names, the cause of imprisonment is set down. Among the prisoners two had been committed for murder, a third for stabbing, a fourth for perjury, a fifth for felony, others as accomplices in the same evil deed, and so on to the end of the sad catalogue. The one bright spot is where we see the names of the priests.

Record Office, Ireland (Crown Office, Queen's Bench), Indictments  
H. 1706. 2F. 16. 15.

A Callend<sup>r</sup> of the Prisoners in her Maties Goale of Newgate  
this present Terme being the 23rd of this Inst. Jan<sup>y</sup>, 1706.

“DOMINICK EAGAN	}	Fryars tryed and convicted at Queen's Bench.
GEORGE MARTIN		
F <sup>FE</sup> LEX <i>alias</i> RANDLE		
DOWLE		
THOMAS BLUNTT	}	Fryars transmitted from Trim.”
JAMES DONOUGH		
PHILLIP BRADY		

JOHN MORRISON, Goaler.

When we read that the interior of Newgate was an appalling scene of corruption, we may form some notion of what these confessors of the faith had to undergo. Add to this the material horrors of that dungeon of which Howard the philanthropist thus writes :—“ I well remember the dreadful state of Dublin Newgate in the beginning of the year 1775, when I saw numbers of poor creatures ill with the gaol fever, unattended and disregarded.” Yet it had been altered and improved about 1750.<sup>1</sup> In its former state Father Felix

<sup>1</sup>Newgate was in Cornmarket. The city prison owed its name to its being connected with the gate of which mention is made of so far back as 1188. This stood where Francis Street now joins Thomas Street. A portion of the old prison still remains at the corner of Lamb Alley. The part of it where Father MacDowell dragged out his existence is thus described in Gilbert's *History of Dublin* (vol. i., page 266) :—“ In the ‘ Black Dog ’ there were twelve rooms for the reception of prisoners, two of which contained five beds each; the others were no better than closets, and held but one bed each. The general rent for lodging in these beds

might well have exclaimed, "It is better with them that were slain by the sword." At his advanced age it was impossible to withstand the effects of such confinement and ill-usage, and he succumbed to it in less than two years. Let us hope that he could be visited and consoled by his brother priests, and still more frequently as his death drew near. When at last the bright morning of February 3rd, 1707, dawned, Father Felix Mac Dowell hailed it as the day of his deliverance here and of his entrance into the eternal joys of that life beyond the grave.

None would have ministered to him with more tender respect than Father Dominic Egan, his brother Dominican, and martyr in his turn, to whose history the remainder of this article will be devoted. He, the last of his Province to suffer for the faith, was a member of the community of Holy Cross Abbey, Tralee. As most of his brethren at the time, he too went through his course of ecclesiastical studies, partly, at least, in some Spanish house of the Order. On his journey homeward, in 1700 (if it be not a misprint instead of 1702), according to O'Heyne and Dr. Burke, he was arrested in Dublin and condemned to prison. There is a discrepancy about the date. According to the legal documents quoted below, it was in 1702. Then, as regards the time he spent in Newgate, Dr. Burke says he died in 1713, whilst the manuscript "*Brevis Notitia*" states that he died after nine years' imprisonment.

The vigilance of the Custom House officials was indeed so strict and constant, that we may well wonder that any priest could on his return from the Continent succeed in passing through the midst of them; yet as we know, by

was one shilling per night for each man, but in particular cases a much higher price was charged. It frequently happened that four or five men slept together in the same bed, each individual still paying the rent of one shilling. Prisoners unable to meet these demands were immediately dragged to a damp subterranean dungeon, about twelve feet square and eight high, which had no light except what was admitted through a common sewer. In this noisome oubliette, frequently fourteen, and sometimes twenty persons were crowded together, and there robbed and abused by criminals, who though under sentence of transportation were admitted to mix among the debtors; and if any person attempted to come up stairs during the day-time, to obtain air or light, he was menaced, insulted, and driven down again by Hawkins, or his satellite Martin Coffey, the tunkey of the gaol."



the special intervention of Providence many devoted missionaries entered Ireland undiscovered, and kept the light of faith burning with undimmed lustre, while those who were captured in the endeavour became so many victims whose blood pleaded to heaven for mercy. O'Heyne who wrote at Louvain, in 1706, mentions Father Mac Egan's fate, which he appears to have learned from Father Peter Kinna, the Prior of Holy Cross, who had, he says, sent him for his work a full account of the members of the Community in Tralee. During his Priorship Father Kinna had received to the habit, besides Brother Dominic MacEgan, nine novices, one of whom was at Louvain in 1706, the others were scattered in various houses of study throughout France and Spain, while the companion of their novitiate was confined on a charge of high treason in a felon's cell in Newgate. Here however, incredible as it may seem, he had the inestimable consolation of saying Mass every day. Not only were his fellow-prisoners allowed to be present, but externs also, some of whom long afterwards related this to Dr. Burke, himself a native of Dublin, born in 1710. We know from its history that bribes were all powerful in Newgate, yet we could not believe that a priest condemned as such would even by this means get permission to perform the sublimest work of his sacred office, and to administer the sacraments, if we were not assured by persons whose veracity is unquestionable that Father Mac Egan was allowed. Under the very eyes of the law, he was committing with impunity the greatest *crime* of which he could be guilty. In default of further information we can only suppose that his relations, or some charitable citizen of Dublin found a sure way to the good graces of the jailer, the illiterate John Morrison. By whatever means it was obtained, the privilege of hearing Mass in Newgate was still more highly prized by those from outside, as at the time the chapels of the city were closed by order of the Lord Lieutenant.

Father Mac Egan's life in prison was that of a true son of St. Dominic. He brought back to the paths of virtue several criminals by his continual admonitions, as well as by the example of his holy life. His zeal and charity were

especially active in regard of those under sentence of death, and among them were many whom he converted to the Catholic religion. Thus did this saintly priest under the most adverse circumstances reap an abundant harvest during his long imprisonment, and prove himself a good and faithful servant in whom the glorious line of Dominican martyrs in Ireland was worthily ended. In the Record Office, Dublin, is still to be seen the original Bill of Indictment, or condemnation of Father Constantine Dominic Mac Egan for being a regular priest. It is almost word for word the same as that of Father Felix Mac Dowell. The indictment is, of course, in Latin, according to the practice of our law courts till fifty or sixty years ago, but the examination is in English. Both these documents were when discovered in a very bad state of preservation, being mildewed and stuck together, and the faded writing on many parts of the parchment containing the bill was at first quite illegible, and on a few it still remains so. The action of the damp for nearly two centuries has also corroded the edges and other parts of the paper on which the examination was written. It should be mentioned that this document is the outside one, or the first of the bundle of indictments (Easter Term, 1702), and therefore the most exposed, which accounts for its present condition, dating as it does from a time when the Records were not preserved with the admirable care that they are at present. The lacunæ or missing parts of the indictment have been filled up in the accompanying translation (the form of such bills being practically invariable), those of the examination have been left blank; in both cases the lacunæ in the originals are indicated here by brackets.

Indictments, &c. [Crown Office, Queen's Bench', Trinity Term, 1702.—No. 1.

Comitatus Civitatis Dublinensis, scilicet jurati pro domina Regina super sacramentum suum dicunt et præsentant quod Dominicus alias Constantinus Egan de Dublino in comitatu Civitatis Dublinensis Regularis sacerdos Anglice "a fryar" de ordine Sancti Dom [ ] de die Maii anno regni dominæ nostræ Annæ dei gratia Angliæ, Scociæ, Ffranciæ et Hiberniæ Reginæ fidei defensoris, &c. primo apud Civitatem Dublini videlicet in [ ] Sancti Michaelis Ar [ ] in Ward Sancti Michaelis

in comitatu ejusdem civitatis vi et armis videlicet gladiis baculis et cultellis, &c., existens Regularis Sacerdos Anglice "a fryar" de ordine Sancti Dominici de Ecclesia Romana remanens in hoc Regno Hiberniae & nunc existens infra comitatum civitatis Dublini praedictae in malum & perniciosum exemplum aliorum in tali casu delinquentium & contra pacem dictae dominae Reginae coronam et dignitatem suam et contra formam Statuti, &c.

Peruse the annexed examination

for proove of this Bill. Billa vera cum sociis

JAMES COTTINGHAM.

Tempore Paschali primo Anno Reginae

Cognovit Indictamentum, i [ ] Iudicium redditum.

Cognovit I [ ].<sup>1</sup>

[ ] com of Dominick als Constantine [ ]  
of y<sup>e</sup> order of St. [ ] taken before me [ ] fforster  
Recorder of y<sup>e</sup> City of Dublin.

Wh [ ] being examined sayeth & confesseth y<sup>t</sup> he this  
Examinant in y<sup>e</sup> yeare 1685 was professed a fryar in y<sup>e</sup> Order  
St. Dominick at Tralee in y<sup>e</sup> County of Kerry and was admitted  
then into y<sup>e</sup> order by Father John Browne, Provincial of y<sup>e</sup> order  
of St. Dominick in Ireland and by Father Peter Kenon who was  
Prior of y<sup>e</sup> Convent of St. Dominicke in y<sup>e</sup> towne of Tralle.  
That y<sup>e</sup> Examinant went from Corke in y<sup>e</sup> yeare 1687 to Spaine  
and there continued till about two yeare and a half last past &  
then the Examinant went to Lisbon in Portugal & there  
continued till his return into this kingdom in y<sup>e</sup> ship called y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>1</sup> County of the city of Dublin, to wit.—The jurors for our lady the Queen, upon their oath say and present that Dominic, *alias* Constantine Egan, of Dublin in the county of the city of Dublin, a regular priest *anglice*, "a fryar" of the Order of Saint Dom[inic on the secon]d day of May, in the first year of the reign of our lady, Queen, by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, came into the city of Dublin, viz. [in the parish] of Saint Michael the Ar[changel] in the ward of Saint Michael, in the county of the same city, with force and arms, viz., with swords, staves, and so forth; he being a regular priest *anglice*, "a fryar" of the Order of Saint Dominic of the Roman Church, and remaining in the Kingdom of Ireland, and at present within the county of the city of Dublin aforesaid, to the evil example of others in the like cause offending, against the peace of our said lady the Queen, her crown and dignity, and against the form of the Statute, in such case made and provided.

Easter Term, first year of the Queen's Reign.

A true bill.

JAMES COTTINGHAM, for Self and Fellows.

He pleaded guilty, and judgment was given accordingly. He pleaded guilty.

George of Dublin, out of which ship this Examinant landed [ ] of May. Th [ ] sayeth y<sup>t</sup> Dr. Pei [ ] Romish Bpp. of Waterf. [ ] this Examinant was desired to del [ ] y<sup>e</sup> small note found in y<sup>e</sup> Ex [ ] papers sayeth that the said Peirse was in Ireland and sent thence by virtue of the late Act of Parliament for banishing the Romish regular Clergy and Bishops, but whether he be now in this kingdom or not this Examinant knoweth not.

*fr. Dominique Egan*

Captum Coram me

2<sup>to</sup> die Maii 1702.

JOHANNES FFORSTER.

The Bishop of Waterford, referred to, the Right Rev. Richard Peirse, was nominated 21st May, 1696. He is, perhaps, the "Father Richard Peirce," one of the chaplains in King James the Second's army.<sup>1</sup> For many years he lived an exile in France. He was Coadjutor to the Archbishop of Sens, and died, aged eighty years, in 1736. The note addressed to him and the other papers have not been preserved. Neither were those which were seized on when Father MacDowell was arrested.

Considerable pains have been taken to discover the indictment of Father George Martin whose name occurs between those of the two Dominicans, Fathers MacEgan and MacDowell, but so far the search has proved fruitless. Judging from the order of names in the Newgate calendar, his indictment ought to be in the Rolls, 1702-1706. True, it is difficult to find anything in them; yet many, if not all, have been carefully examined. However, it may be useful to note that the MacDowell indictment was not in its place, but amongst those marked as belonging to a term earlier by several years; nor was the MacEgan indictment where the *Hibernia Dominicana* would have led one to look for it.

<sup>1</sup> See a list in *State of the Protestants in Ireland under King James's Government*. London: 1691.



That Father Martin was not a Dominican, may for the present be taken as negatively proved by the silence of our historians. It is not known of what order he was. Inquiries were made respecting him in various religious houses, but no one appeared to have ever heard of his name. Perhaps some of our readers will throw light on the subject. At any rate, the documents recording Father Martin's fate are probably still extant in the Four Courts, Dublin. The same obscurity still rests over the history of two out of the three religious who were sent up from Trim, but in their case it is to be feared that we shall never learn more, at least from legal records, for those of Trim prison do not extend further back than 1837. The three had been in Newgate fourteen months before the date of the calendar mentioned above, as appears from another, of November 6th, 1705, which is also kept in the Record Office. (Queen's Bench Indictments, Michaelmas Term, 1705.) This (the only other one so far discovered) contains also the names of Father Mac Egan and Father Martin; but, of course, not that of Father Mac Dowell, who was captured in the following April (1706). With regard to the third of the Trim priests, Father Philip Brady, it is very probable that he was a Franciscan. Marsh's Library has amongst its treasures the "Particular Account of the Romish Clergy Secular and Regular in every Parrish of the Diocese of Dublin, March 2nd, 1697" (v. 3. l. 18), and this list contains under the heading of "St. Nicholas without the walls, Regulars of y<sup>e</sup> Order of St. Francis," the name of "Philip Brady." If our conjecture is correct, we may suppose that Father Brady was subsequently sent to the house of his Order at Multifarnham or to that in Trim; and arrested there some time before November, 1705. None of the other names mentioned in the Newgate Calendar occurs in the "Particular Account." It was evidently drawn up in connection with the "Act of Banishment" passed in the same year, as a preparation for the thorough execution of that infamous law—in order that the Government should be fully informed of the names and residences of the Dublin priests that were to be driven out of the country, as well as of those who were to be

suffered to remain. The list was deposited in the Protestant Archbishop's library.

The statute referred to in virtue of which the two Dominican martyrs were condemned is the following:—

THE NINTH YEAR OF WILLIAM III., 1697.

Chapter I. (Ireland).

*An Act for banishing all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all regulars of the Popish clergy out of this kingdom.*

Whereas it is notoriously known that the late rebellions in this kingdom have been contrived, promoted, and carried on by Popish archbishops, bishops, Jesuits, and other ecclesiastical persons of the Romish clergy; and forasmuch as the peace and publick safety of this kingdom is in danger, by the great number of said archbishops, bishops, Jesuits, friers, and other regular Romish clergy now residing here, and settling in fraternities and societies contrary to law, and to the great impoverishing of many of his Majesty's subjects of this kingdom, who are forced to maintain and support them, which said Romish clergy do not only endeavour to withdraw his Majesty's subjects from their obedience, but do daily stir up and move sedition and rebellion to the great hazard of the ruine and desolation of this kingdom; for the prevention of all which mischiefs his Majesty is graciously pleased that it be enacted, and be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, that all Popish archbishops, bishops, vicars general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friers, and all other regular Popish clergy, and all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall depart out of this kingdom before the first day of May, which shall be in the year of our Lord One Thousand Six Hundred and Ninety-eight: and if any of the said ecclesiastical persons shall be at any time after the first day of May within the kingdom, they, and every of them, shall suffer imprisonment, and remain in prison without bail or mainprize till he or they shall be transported beyond seas, out of his Majesty's dominions, wherever his Majesty, his heirs or successors, or the chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being shall think fit; and if any person so transported shall return again into this kingdom they, and every of them, shall be guilty of high treason; and every person so offending shall for his offence be adjudged a traitor, and shall suffer loss and forfeit as in case of high treason.

This was not to be a dead letter. Measures were at once taken to give it full effect, to make one sweeping stroke that

would, as was fondly imagined, blot out for ever the name of the Catholic Church in Ireland. Many a Protestant magistrate repeated in spirit the hopes of a certain Lord Justice who fifty years before promised to clear the kingdom of every Papist before a twelvemonth. No effort was spared to discover the hiding-places of the bishops and others against whom the plot was laid, and no time was lost in driving them all out of the country. Two months after the Act came into operation, on the 7th of July, 1698, only one archbishop and three bishops remained—in hourly danger; the others were scattered over Belgium, France, and Spain. Four hundred and fifty-four regular priests (one hundred and ninety from Galway, one hundred and fifty-three from Dublin, thirty-seven from Cork, thirty-six from Waterford, &c.), were also sent into exile. It has been said by a distinguished writer that at no period in our history, not excepting even the Cromwellian, were the prospects of the Irish Catholics gloomier than at the close of the seventeenth century. The darkest schemes then took the place of open brutality, and a systematic plan for the destruction of the hierarchy as a whole was substituted for the murder of individuals. The persecutor sought souls rather than bodies. It was not the annihilation of a nation that was aimed at now, so much as its perversion. It was a repetition in part of Cromwellian cruelty, with perhaps more than Cromwellian astuteness.

But there were more with us than against us. Saints and angels pleaded our cause with redoubled fervour. The Mother of Mercy looked down on the faithful people now about to pass through another fearful ordeal, and a miracle proclaimed her tender compassion and powerful aid. Far away from Ireland, an Irish picture of the Blessed Virgin and Child is venerated in the Cathedral of Raab, in Hungary, where it was brought by Walter Lynch, Bishop of Clonfert, who was obliged to fly in 1652. His library had been burned, he himself almost starved to death in Innisboffin, and all he possessed when he reached Raab as its future Coadjutor-Bishop was his beloved picture. He had succeeded in preserving it at least from the sacrilegious hands of the

Puritan soldiery. On St. Patrick's Day in 1697, this figure of our Lady was covered with a bloody sweat for three hours. It was like the agony in the garden. The prodigy was witnessed by devout multitudes, yet awe-struck as they were, perhaps but few knew its full meaning, and realized what was about to happen in the distant isle from which the picture came.

Ireland's history for some years was to be once more a page of blood, but she who is the comfortress of the afflicted and the Queen of Martyrs was there to help her children. Even in the thick of the conflict, in 1701, the one Archbishop, Dr. Comerford of Cashel, was still at his post. He was now the sole survivor, for the Bishops of Dromore and Cork were in prison. But help came before long. And here and there, in wood and bog, on barren mountain and by the lonely shore, some religious who had managed to elude the vigilance of the keen-eyed officials charged with the execution of the edict, assisted the heroic secular clergy. These religious must have given the priest-hunters a great deal of trouble. It is said that one of the captains of the transport ships complained pathetically that it was very hard to get rid of the Dominicans. The Provincial, whose name occurs above, Father Ambrose O'Connor, states in his report on the state of Ireland, presented to Clement XI. in 1704, that there were about ninety of his subjects in the country, "*ingenti cum fructu occulte evangelizantes*," besides five who were in prison for the faith. One of these was Father Dominic Egan. The reader has already seen how he and another who subsequently joined him in Newgate were captured as they came to the help of their brethren.

Let us hope that at no distant day Catholic Ireland may behold her glorious children raised to the altars of the Church, and that those beatified martyrs from their thrones in heaven may help us to tread, however feebly, in their own bright footsteps, and thus at length to reach our home.

REGINALD WALSH, O.P.



## A PLEA FOR THE STUDY OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

AMONG the many ways in which the knowledge of our holy faith is being steadily thrust before the eyes of the world, there is one worthy of special remark, which does not seem to have been sufficiently noticed by the Catholic press. I allude to the good work which is being done by the various Archaeological and Historical Societies established throughout the kingdom. In many counties of England, we have such societies, which hold sundry evening sessions each autumn and winter, at which papers are read and curiosities exhibited, connected with matters of local interest. In summer, an "out-day" is held, when a visit of the members is made to some spot of well-known historical interest.

In Ireland, there is a famous society, founded in 1849, as the "Kilkenny Archaeological Society," but recently re-named the "Royal Society of Antiquarians," which has lately broken out into unusual activity, and within a short period has enrolled a great number of new members. On its list, one is glad to see the names of a cardinal, a bishop, and many priests, though the bulk of the Society consists of Protestant clergy and laity. At the very enjoyable re-unions held annually in various parts of Ireland, places which teem with historical interest are visited by the Society, when every smallest ruin, monument, and sculptured stone is made to tell its story of the past. The mutual discussions and courteous intermingling of savants of all denominations, which take place on such occasions, are most pleasing, and much valuable knowledge is interchanged, at what a cynical world regards as merely a social pic-nic.

It is the object of this article to show forth the great benefit and interest which Catholics, whether laity or clergy, might derive from attending such meetings, either of their own county Society, or the general one of Great Britain or Ireland. By this natural interchange of ideas, which cannot but tend to the mutual benefit of all parties, such societies would derive great good from the presence and social intercourse of educated Catholics. As the study of archæology

usually includes constant references to the "Church of our Fathers," a clear and solid proof is ever being unconsciously put forward for our present *continuity with the past*. In this way error cannot fail to be quashed, and truth be pushed forward into that light of day, which, without an Antiquarian Society, would never have any chance of enlightening such savants as are prejudiced against the Catholic Church.

Thus, in a visit made to a ruin, or in a discussion over an old document, or in the scrutiny of an old stone inscription, there is exposed to view the *uniform* teaching of the Church in *every* age and *every* clime. In fact, may not Christian archæology be considered the "handmaid of theology," since it is so essentially bound up with the first beginnings of the faith in every land, and at the same time illustrates not only the doctrines of the Church, but even the smallest rites and ceremonies connected therewith. Ancient manuscripts and old documents are precious for similar reasons; yet after the greatest care has been given to decipher and interpret the same, there often still exists, even among the wisest, a difference of opinion on some knotty point. What a host of Irish monastic records have perished in the ravages of the Danes, by being burnt, or cast into lakes or rivers; and therefore it is not surprising that we know so little of their history, when the monastic dwelling of early ages were more than once burnt to the ground. Safer, then, than old archives, because they have survived the storms and tempests, as well as the fury of invaders, whether Danes or Cromwellians, are the stone monuments yet left to us. A document may be misinterpreted, or corrupted, but a ruin, a sculptured cross, a sepulchral inscription, no one can tamper with. Take, for instance, the high cross of Clonmacnoise, called the "Cross of the Scriptures," with its wealth of sculpture, and its two brief Irish inscriptions at the base, on east and west side. What royal tombstone in Europe is better authenticated than this, which these few words proclaim clearly almost a thousand years after: "A prayer for Flann, son of Maelschlin;" "A prayer for Colman, who made this cross over King Flann"? The shape of a window or doorway, the peculiar treatment of the

simplest as well as the most elaborate decoration, all speak alike to us more or less unerringly of the exact period when pious hands produced these works of art. Whilst the student of archæology may essay to solve the more abstruse questions—say the origin of “round towers,” or the birth-place of St. Patrick—the simple and uninitiated Catholic may see at first sight the history of his faith in the glorious ruins scattered over his native land.

To give an example. A school-party at their annual excursion, hold their pic-nic amid some ecclesiastical ruins, and after their repast on the green sward of the *quondam* chancel or transept, the tottering fabric is duly inspected. Should they be non-Catholics, their tour of inspection will produce but little effect upon them; and beyond sitting in the old sedilia or sacrarium, or climbing upon an altar or tomb, but little good comes of their visit. Teachers and pupils are alike unable to puzzle out the various parts of the sacred fabric, simply because it was built by their forefathers for quite another worship than their own, but which their own has supplanted. But if the party be Catholic, the whole thing is then clear. They have come out, say, for a day’s fresh air, from the murky factory town, boasting of no mean church, where a High Mass is of common occurrence; and thus the simplest child of ordinary religious intelligence can grasp the main features of the abbey ruins. Every detail, though decayed or broken, agrees with their own church at home. Nay, the sad and forelorn condition of the old church seems to bring more forcibly to their inquiring gaze and touch, the venerable liturgy for which their ancestors raised it. Here, the falling altar, if its stone be intact, will show the five incised crosses, once anointed by the bishop, and perhaps the yet undisturbed relics lie beneath: “*Laetabuntur Sancti in cubilibus suis.*” (Ps. cxlix.) In the right-hand wall appears the piscina, with its ledge for the cruets, and the small hole or sink, where the acolyte of those days poured water over the celebrant’s fingers at the “*Lavabo.*” Indeed, in many parish churches of England, which were rebuilt a century ago in the hideous Grecian style then in vogue, the piscina

has been re-instated at the south-east corner of the chancel, and is often the *only* mark left to tell of the liturgy of our forefathers. Then the veriest school-girl recognises the sedilia, in the carved and canopied recesses, which often excel for elegant decoration those in our modern churches. In like manner, to the Catholic "excursionist," the old chapter-house and spacious cloisters recall the glories of a western monasticism, as the large fish-ponds bear witness to the severity of a rule, which forbade meat. Thus, their hearts warm to Mother Church, "*semper eadem et ubique*;" and this early lesson in Christian archæology, unconsciously learnt during a summer's ramble, leaves a life-long impression on the most thoughtless.

The pursuit of archæology in England and Ireland differs considerably. Firstly, whilst there is one such principal society, very flourishing and energetic,<sup>1</sup> with only a few country societies, for the whole of Ireland, in England there is one to almost every county. Though the former has existed as the Kilkenny Archæological Society, from 1849, and has been very active year after year, as the Quarterly Journals amply testify, yet it has a large field for labour in the patient investigation of those ruins, small and fragmentary, which appear on every few square miles of Irish soil. In England, on the other hand, though our ecclesiastical remains are more ornate and massive—witness a Tintern, a Fountains, a Furness—yet this, in fact, is easily accounted for by reason of the riches of the Benedictine and Cistercian Orders, who built their stately abbeys at a period when the greatest impetus was being given to ecclesiastical architecture by the Norman bishops and their successors. But in Ireland, the small fragments of sacred edifices are, as a rule, some centuries older than most English ruins, and their style is more primitive; in fact, the *most primitive* in Europe, as witness those of Inishmurray. If, therefore, they at times betray a deficiency

<sup>1</sup> Under the energy of Mr. Cochrane, the Hon. Secretary to Royal Society of Irish Antiquaries, the Fellows and Members increased in last three years from 415 to 990; and the receipts from £172 14s. 4d. to £650 2s. 9d.



of elaborate detail such as adorn the ruin above mentioned, yet can they boast of something far dearer, in which the latter fail; viz., the glorious memories of so many saints that have sanctified the Irish centres of piety and learning. I allude to those early ages, when Inisfail was the university of the European nations; and as, nowadays, men boast of having graduated at Oxford or Cambridge, so then it was a diploma equally cherished by a student of Gaul or Germany that he had been *mandatus in Hiberniam*. And so it came to pass, that when these students from foreign lands flocked to the Western Isle, and directed their weary footsteps by rugged roads to Armagh, or Clonard, or Glendalough, or Clonmacnoise, the lofty round tower, or *Cloiteach*, bursting into view, would tell them their journey was at an end. With what joy would the bell sounding therefrom, or the beacon-light, seen through the gloaming, gladden these weary foreigners! Even as the *Magi ab Oriente* were gently allured by a star that trailed to earth behind the poor cot, where the "True Light" was to teach them a wisdom they little dreamt of, so in the austere poverty of the old Irish schools the beacon-tower told of the light of faith, which illumined the island, then a vast Thebaid of hermits! Like a true fostering mother, an "Alma Mater," did each Irish school welcome and feed her adopted sons. Nay, more, as she sated their thirst for knowledge, she also refreshed the soul of each with the banquet of Christ's Body, as that great chalice can testify, which, though found at Ardagh, was doubtless used at the Cathedral of Clonmacnoise, on the Shannon.<sup>1</sup> What Catholic of any nationality standing amidst these fragmentary and deserted ruins, scattered up and down the "sister isle," crowding the islands that surround her coast and adore her lakes, but is deeply moved by the memories that haunt each holy spot! If the corpulent Dr. Johnson was for the nonce awed by the sight of the sea-irt Iona, where stood in lovely grandeur the

<sup>1</sup> There seems but little doubt that this unique chalice for the communion of the faithful, now in the Dublin Museum, was the special treasure of this spot, as proved by the Rev. P. A. Yorke. *Vide I. E. RECORD*, ix. 316.

Church of St. Columbkille, what should be the feelings of a Catholic layman or ecclesiastic, as he gazes on the altars yet standing at Iniscealtra, Cashel, Athassell, Killaghie, &c.? On these "Bethels" of the New Law the Holy Sacrifice was once offered, and though the rank nettles and docks flourish there now, and cattle defile these forsaken sanctuaries, still the words of Jacob ring in our ear: "*Terribilis est locus iste!*" Truly, there is here a vast field for antiquarian research, which year by year presents a rich harvest for the painstaking student, or the members of an archæological society.

In conclusion, every good must accrue to such a society, and to those who join it, by the interchange of knowledge, which inevitably follows. Within the last two or three years an unusually large number have entered the Royal Antiquarian Society of Ireland, in which number many a priest's name appears, though the bulk are not of the Catholic Church. Among the Vice-presidents figure a cardinal, a bishop, a Jesuit father, too well known to need mention, and some distinguished parish priests. The annual subscription of ten shillings cannot be called exorbitant; and the four Quarterly Journals, treating of all the Society's transactions, and profusely illustrated, are well worth the subscription. At one of the recent meetings of the Society, the distinguished President told the writer that there could hardly be a more suitable member for such a society than a Catholic priest, because archæology was so deeply connected with the edifices, rites, and ceremonies of the Catholic Church. If such be the case—and surely none will doubt it—then that well-known Celtic enthusiasm and love of "fatherland" ought to allure many more to join this Society. If not able to attend all the various meetings, held some four or five times a year, at least members might attend the summer excursion, when some renowned locality is thoroughly "overhauled," its antiquities, history, and legends ransacked, and the chronicle of the past unfolded in such a manner that is keenly relished by all, but by none more than a Catholic antiquarian.

WILFRID DALLOW, M.R.S.A.I.

BLESSED JULIANA OF CORNILLON AND  
CORPUS CHRISTI.<sup>1</sup>

1192-1258.

IN his treatise on the Priesthood, St. Chrysostom speaks of a vision which, he says, he learnt from a friend, whose eyes had been opened during the Holy Sacrifice to see the angelic band kneeling round the altar. Invisible to mortal sight, but known to God, they have their earthly counterpart in those few and chosen souls who live for the Blessed Sacrament. This bodyguard of the Holy Eucharist has existed through all the ages of the Church, but like the angelic prototype, it worships by men unseen. Lives are consumed in adoration, and the world knows not of them, or if it did, would call them useless, whilst *neque suscitatis neque evigilare faciatis dilectam donec ipsa velit* has ever been the cry of the Church.

Our Lord has seemed to follow one line of action in those special manifestations of Himself, on which the Church has put her seal. He has chosen women to be the depositories of His secrets, and this in spite of what the world, and even religious men, might have to say against the visions of the weaker sex. In the two most notable instances of private revelations, He made His will known to obscure nuns; and they by carrying it out in face of every obstacle, showed forth His divine strength in their own personal weakness. It must not be forgotten that the holy women were the first at the sepulchre, and that through them even the chief Apostles learnt of the resurrection. After being charged with that great message for Peter, no other mission can appear too exalted for womanhood. But the more wonderful the tidings, the weaker the instrument. A treasure of holiness may well be found with a total dearth of worldly goods, and all that the world holds dear. The type of saint

<sup>1</sup> The details of Blessed Juliana's life have been taken from *Le Saint Sacrement* by M. Le Docteur Cruls, and Chardon *Histoire des Sacrements* has been consulted for particulars concerning the worship of the Holy Eucharist.

who receives our Lord's divine manifestations is buried with Him out of men's sight, unknown to her own generation; and, what is more, unknown to those immediately connected with her. Solitude of heart and mind is almost a condition for the reception of these heavenly messages.

Contrasting these two revelations—the one made to Blessed Juliana of Cornillon, and the other to Blessed Margaret Mary, which have given new life to the Church, we may remark a special feature in Blessed Juliana. In the glory of Corpus Christi she has been well-nigh forgotten. We have been told vaguely that there was a time when the Hidden Mystery was yet more hidden than it is now, and that the divine message was whispered to an obscure nun who carried out her mission by exalting our Lord, while remaining herself unknown. Men's eyes are scarcely more open to the earthly angels of the Holy Eucharist than to the heavenly, and it is in accordance with the great Mystery of the altar that they too should be all but invisible. This element of silence and oblivion is less apparent in other manifestations; though, in a certain measure, the necessary accompaniment of every divine favour.

*Neque suscitatis neque ecigilare faciat is dilectam donec ipsa velit.* Juliana's story is soon told: a rich inner life of contemplation, an outward life marked by the note of persecution for her beloved Lord. She was born at Liège in 1192, and in 1197, already an orphan, she went with her only sister, Agnes, to a convent at Cornillon, where the nuns, primarily instituted for the care of lepers, received pupils. Cornillon is in the town of Liège. Both are honoured by their connection with Blessed Juliana: the one where the saint passed the greater part of her life, and received our Lord's communications; the other as being the first to celebrate Corpus Christi. And Liège is still distinguished as the **city of the Blessed Sacrament.**

From her earliest years Juliana was powerfully attracted to the Holy Eucharist. Contemplation came naturally to her, and the very sight of the child, rapt and motionless before the altar, made others pray. There is no spiritual sight without penance, or at least without the desire for it.



One day when she saw the nuns fasting, Juliana, listening only to the secret desire of her heart, which she might well have taken for a true inspiration, imitated their example. The Sister, who had the care of the child, a wise and experienced religious, noted her act, and reproved her sharply, as if for a fault, telling her that nothing of the kind should be done without the safeguard of obedience. Then she took Juliana to the garden, which was covered with deep snow, and put her in the midst of it as a penance for her self-inflicted fasting. Finally, she concluded her lesson by sending Juliana to confess her fault. "Go back home," said the confessor, "and as a penance for having fasted without leave, tell your mistress to give you an egg for your breakfast."

No one has greater need of obedience than those who receive supernatural communications. This little anecdote was not without its value in Juliana's life. Soon we find her hungering after the heavenly food of the Blessed Sacrament alone. She took so little nourishment that the Sisters frequently asked her what she could eat, and she would answer: "The most delicious food you can give me," meaning the Divine Object of her desires.

The spiritual dreariness of the times penetrated into religious houses. It was not the custom at Cornillon for the nuns to assist daily at Mass. Juliana's mistress found out a way of satisfying her devotion by making her a little oratory in a retired part of the convent. Thus withdrawn from all, Juliana was contented to pour out her soul to God, although our Lord was not there in His Sacramental presence. Already her prayer bordered on ecstasy. She often lost consciousness of this world, and was brought back to it with difficulty by the efforts of the Sisters.

It is entirely in keeping with her mission towards the Hidden Mystery of Divine Love, that we know so little of her life beyond her angelic spirit of prayer. After passing her early years at the foot of the altar, she became at 14 (1206) a novice at this same convent of Cornillon, which had been founded, as I have said, for the benefit of lepers. In 1222 she was elected prioress of her community. Thus her time was divided between prayer and the sweet duties of charity

towards some of God's most afflicted creatures. She was only sixteen when she was shown the mysterious vision which was to pursue her day and night for twenty years. In her prayer she saw a moon, in full form, and radiant with light, except for a dark shadow over its disk. Its fulness remained thus strangely incomplete. No one could explain the vision, or even offer any possible explanation. At the end of two years Juliana determined to pray for a light. God regarded her prayer. In a dream she heard these words: "The moon, which is appearing to you, is a figure of My Church. The dark line passing over it, and veiling some of its brightness, is to signify that a great feast in honour of the Blessed Sacrament is wanting to complete its glory. It is written in My eternal decrees that the institution of the Divine Eucharist is to be solemnized, not only on Maundy Thursday, when the Church is celebrating the mystery of My passion and death, but on a day set apart for a special feast throughout the universe." Then our Lord deigned to reveal further secrets to His servant. She, and she alone, was to be the bearer of this message to the world, and to bring about the institution of the feast which He desired.

During eighteen years Juliana's humility struggled with the divine commands. Conquered at last by their persistency, she set herself to her appointed work, although, as her biographer says, she had wept so much at what it involved that tears of blood were no figure of speech.

Friendship in the hearts of the saints is a wonderful factor in bringing glory to God. It is true that the thing in its natural expression may be realized by a good heathen, in which case it begins and ends with this world. With the saint it reaches far over the boundaries of time, and penetrates into the home of eternity. Juliana's two friends, Isabelle de Huy and the Blessed Eve, have their place in the history of Corpus Christi.

Isabelle was a nun of her community whom she had herself attracted to Cornillon. In those days devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was not fostered as it is now, but Isabelle begged for it as a grace from God. For a year she

prayed unceasingly, and was rewarded by a supernatural insight into the Hidden Mystery. From that time she was able to offer Juliana the encouragement of perfect sympathy. In her tribulations for the Blessed Sacrament, the saint rested on these two hearts, which understood her so well.

At twenty, Eve became an anchoress, a form of religious life which has now disappeared. The anchorite and anchoress passed their days in a solitary cell in communion with God. Blessed Eve fixed her abode in one of these dwellings adjoining the Church of St. Martin. She lived her life of prayer and penance, under the same roof as the Blessed Sacrament; but it was Juliana, in her case also, who drew her powerfully to this mystery. The three hearts soon made one in their desire for the exaltation of the Holy Eucharist.

Besides the mark of weakness, the institution of Corpus Christi was to have the mark of the cross. It seemed as if God had waited for His servant's acceptance of her mission to open the flood-gates of persecution against her. She had charged a young priest of Cornillon, who belonged to her own congregation, to compose the Office of the Blessed Sacrament. In the meantime, Godfrey, the superior of the house, died in 1233, and Roger, a bad vicious man, succeeded him. The holiness of Juliana was a reproach to him, and he sought to have her removed from Cornillon. To this end any pretext was good. He had recourse to calumny, and for a time it was allowed to prevail. Juliana left Cornillon for the friendly cell of Eve. How the anchoress was able to receive her is not explained; but at the end of three months justice was done to the saint. Roger was deposed, and Juliana witnessed not the triumph of her mission, but its humble inauguration. In 1247 Corpus Christi was celebrated at Liège. The glory of having initiated it belongs to a single sanctuary, the very church which formed the dwelling-place of blessed Eve, and now contains her shrine. The prince-bishop of Liège, Robert de Torok, had been won from indifference to enthusiasm in the cause of the new feast. His last act had been to order its celebration, which he did not live to see. All was to be the work of God. The faithful three watched and prayed.

The new bishop was hostile to Juliana. He strengthened the hands of her enemies. Roger became for the second time superior at Cornillon; and the mob, infuriated against Juliana for not acknowledging his authority, broke into her oratory, crying out for her blood. Once more the saint shook from her feet the dust of Cornillon. Taking with her three of her sisters, she retired first to the Abbey of Robermont (1248), and afterwards to Namur. There, in a house offered to her by a charitable priest, she passed the years of exile, begging her bread, with no earthly consolation but the affection of her sisters. She was rich in having the Blessed Sacrament, and she knew by a divine intimation that it was to be her sole remaining treasure. At Namur she lost two of her sisters, and at Salzinnes Isabelle was taken from her (1255). The last home of her exile was at Fosses. There, cut off from all earthly ties, and buried with Christ in God, she died in April, 1258. Her feast is kept, where allowed, on April 6th. Not many years ago the Queen of the Belgians petitioned the Sovereign Pontiff to grant it to Catholic Belgium, Juliana's country. Blessed Eye, at Liege, received her spiritual inheritance, her mission towards the outward glory of the Blessed Sacrament. In 1261, Pantaleon, who, as Archdeacon of Liege, had been the friend of Juliana and Eye, became Pope under the title of Urban IV. He put the seal of his supreme authority on the worship which had been their life-long devotion, by instituting the feast of the Blessed Sacrament on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday,<sup>1</sup> and making it a solemnity of the first class for the universal Church. His Brief to blessed Eye was dated 8th September, 1264. He died a month later. It is to Urban IV. that we owe our present office of the Blessed Sacrament. It is said that he commissioned St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas each to prepare one, and that when Thomas read his first aloud at the Pope's desire, Bonaventure in admiration of what he heard, tore up his own. Nevertheless, Pope Urban's decree respecting the feast of Corpus Christi lay dormant for forty years. Pope John XXII. published it soon after his

<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that the feast of the Holy Trinity is due to St. Thomas of Canterbury.



accession (1316), and imposed its observance on Christendom. Eve alone remained to rejoice at the solemn sanction of the Holy See, the beginning of triumph. Juliana contemplated it from the heavenly presence of our Lord. In His sight it was she who had built the temple, although on earth her chief work had been gathering together the stones, sharp and heavy stones, which had wounded her hands and her heart; for if the mysterious vision led to Corpus Christi, it led also along the thorny road of calumny, detachment, and exile.

The Blessed Sacrament is the life of the Church; yet the full germ contained in the divine seed was not at once apparent. Our Lord committed Himself "with His own hand" to the guardianship of the Church. The precious germ was there from the beginning, but hidden from the eyes of men. This central dogma of the Christian faith has followed the course of development, which, in all spiritual things, means life. We alone are the primitive Church; yet we are more, for the tree was not planted yesterday; and they, who wish to see the articles of faith as they were in the Apostles' days, would return at once to the acorn. In this sense nature is a faithful image of the Church, producing as it does, a variety of fruit and flower from one original stock. Through the almost endless possibilities of seed scattered into the ground, we have the same principle of resurrection repeating itself. The floral art delights in producing new flowers from the earth without fearing for them the reproach of being excrescences. They are the result of greater knowledge, of more delicate and scientific gardening.

Applying these thoughts to Blessed Juliana and her mission, it may be remarked that the fragrant flower of the Holy Eucharist did not at once put forth all its blossoms. A mystical flower, the seasons of special flowering have been in God's hand, according as the darkness or coldness of men's hearts required its spiritual sweetness. Before the institution of Corpus Christi the worship of the Blessed Sacrament was restricted to Mass and Communion. There was no Exposition, Benediction, or Procession, the three outward acts of our modern *cultus*. The Procession and

Exposition were not absolutely unknown, but neither were they generally practised till after the apostacy. On the other hand, reservation of the Blessed Sacrament dates from the earliest times, although it was differently carried out, according to the country. In some places it was suspended over the altar in a hanging pyx, a custom followed by Belgium and England. In Italy generally it was not suspended, but placed on the altar, not necessarily the high altar. Indeed, those ages seemed to delight in making the Holy Eucharist still more hidden. It was sometimes kept at the side of the altar, in pillars, or in the sacristy. Hence the word *sacrarium*. The feast of Corpus Christi was introduced into England from Belgium between 1320 and 1325. Its hidden sweetness went forth from Liege to the whole Christian people. The great procession of Corpus Christi is the final triumph of the feast, a pageant more of heaven than earth.

It was not till the sixteenth century that Benediction and Exposition were popularly adopted: and even now it is possible to find regions where Benediction is not given oftener than once a month. It would be in vain, therefore, to seek in the early Church for the full expansion of this worship. Seed time is not the glory of summer. It has been with the Blessed Sacrament as with every other devotion of our faith: Corpus Christi and all that it has brought was *in posse* before it was *in esse*.

This is the unfolding of the ages which the eagle eye of Augustine descried. Those who come after us will see greater wonders than we see, for the Church is a faithful imitator of her divine Lord: and of Him the Evangelist writes that He grew in grace and knowledge: a mysterious growth, where all was perfect grace and knowledge from the first. As the growth of our Lord, so is that of the Church. It is the gradual unfolding of a lovely flower. The latter ages increase in knowledge, because every century brings out more clearly the hidden wisdom of the Church, which was in her, but not as yet disclosed.

M. H. ALLIES.

“HORÆ LITURGICÆ:” OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL.  
VI.

SOME MASSES FROM THE “COMMUNE SANCTORUM.”

THE COMMON OF A CONFESSOR, NOT A BISHOP.

MASS : “JUSTUS UT PALMA.”

(St. Peter Alcantara, October 19.)

**A** GAIN do we come to adore the Lord as the King of Confessors in the Mass of the great saint of penance. He who despised earth's vain joys and counted the bright spoils of the world as so much sordid filth, now rejoicing has attained heavenly rewards. He was conspicuous for virtue and faith, and sedulous in acknowledging God's sovereignty; and now his fasts and penances are changed into the eternal feastings of heaven. (Cf. *Hymn. ad Laudes.*)

The Introit (Ps. xci.) touches at once on St. Peter's mortification as being the secret of his holiness. “The just one flourishes as palm-tree, and as the cedar of Libanus is he multiplied. He is planted in the house of the Lord and in the courts of the house of our God. Lo! it is a goodly thing to acknowledge the Lord, and to sing to Thy name, O Thou the Most High.” As we mentioned in a former Mass,<sup>1</sup> the palm-tree is the type of mortification, while the cedar with its sweet-smelling incorruptibility is the image of the result penance works in our soul. So these words are peculiarly appropriate to St. Peter Alcantara, for “like the palm-tree in Cadés” (Eccli. xxiv. 18) was he “lifted up” to be to a wondering world an example of heroic mortification and perpetual warfare against fallen nature. The lowly son of the Seraphic Saint of Assisi followed his holy patriarch up the straight narrow way of perfect poverty, and became a most exact and rigid observer of this the rich inheritance which St. Francis gave his order. Nothing but a thread-bare tunic covered his body, worn out with endless watchings, fastings, stripes, cold, and all manner of austerities. He made a pact with that which his

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, page 723.

Holy Father had called his “ Brother Ass ” never to give it rest in this world so as to secure its eternal glory in heaven. It was this perpetual salting wherewith he was salted (cf. St. Matthew, v. 13) that made his soul like the cedar, incorruptible, and giving forth, as he grew in virtue, the sweet smell of good works to his Lord. He was a tree of the Father’s own planting (cf. St. Matthew, xv. 13); and therefore he flourished and increased, and bore such good fruit to the divine Husbandman, when He went down into His garden of nuts to see the fruits of the valley, and to see whether the vine flourished, and the pomegranates budded (cf. Cant. vi. 11), that He transplanted that tree to the Paradise of God, and set up the remembrance thereof in the Church which is the court of the house of the Lord. His glory now in heaven shows us how goodly it is to confess God to be our Lord and Master; for we shall thus, like St. Peter, sing for ever to the Name of the Most High: that Name which was written “ faithful and true,” and which no man knew but Himself (Apoc. xix. 12). He tells it to His elect in heaven, and it makes the sweetest melody in their souls as its majestic harmony rolls and eternally reaches the land of the living—“ King of kings and Lord of lords ” (*ibid.* 16).

The Collect is proper, and recalls St. Peter’s heroic life of penance and his wonderful gift of contemplating. In it Holy Church prays that by his merits and prayers we may learn how to mortify our flesh, and thus securely reach heaven. St. Theresa, who was directed by our saint, was one day told by God that anyone who asked for any favour in St. Peter’s name would presently be heard. May then this holy saint plead for us, and get us courage to imitate him in bearing about in our bodies the dying of Jesus, that His divine life may be manifested in us here below and in heaven for ever (cf. 2. Cor. iv. 10).

The Epistle is the one found in the second place in this Mass, and is from St. Paul’s to the Philippians (iii.). As in the other Masses, this one also contains an ideal picture of what a saint should be; and reading it along with our Brevary we can at once see how closely St. Peter followed the model.



What the world counts as gain and desirable, he for Christ's sake esteemed as so much loss. Noble birth and worldly interests were of no value to him, and right willingly did he give up all to become a poor Franciscan Friar. He would not use even his natural gifts save at the call of holy obedience, and then his labours were blessed with fruit a hundred-fold. Even the peace of his first convent he gave up, because he found there hindrances in the way of his advancement in God's love; and so he, by divine inspiration and with the Pope's blessing, set out on the difficult path of reform. The world he had rejected ran after him; nobles and kings paid him their homage and sought to have him for their counsellor; but he humbly declined these honours and worldly gains, which he counted as so much dung. And why? He had learnt their true value by the eminent knowledge of Jesus Christ, his Lord, gained in those hours of heavenly contemplation which sweetened his life of penance. How could he find room for love of worldly things, when the love of God and his neighbour was so strong in his heart that it used to burn within him as a very fire, and fill him with such a physical heat that often, even in the depths of winter, was he obliged to rush out of his poor cell in the open air to try and cool the ardour which inflamed him. The eminent knowledge of his Lord he attained so absorbed his whole being that he often forgot to eat for days at a time, and it, as it were, lifted him physically above the earth. He was constantly seen whilst praying lifted up and remain suspended in the air; and his face gleamed with dazzling rays of light like to Moses' when he spoke face to face with the Lord as a man speaketh unto his friend (cf. Ex. xxxiii. 11). St. Peter knew well that no justice could come to him through the law he felt warring within him against his soul (cf. Rom. vii. 23), but only by faith in a Head crowned with thorns. Thus did he determine to become likened to Him in the fellowship of suffering, and be conformed to His death; for this was the only way to rise again with Him Whom he followed after in the hope of understanding Him by Whom he was indeed understood.

We meditate in the Gradual (Ps. xxxvi.) on St. Peter's

great gift of contemplative prayer, wherein he learnt wisdom and judgment, and the knowledge of secret things with the discernment of spirits. This St. Theresa tells us; and she could speak with authority, for St. Peter had tried her spirit when she was setting out on her life's work, and had found it was of God, and had become her ever-wise and prudent director. How could he be otherwise, for the law of God was ever in his heart. It was no wonder that his steps failed not, and that he was able to set others in the way of safety. Yes, and his love of God's law made him blessed for ever, for it filled him with that holy fear whence springs true wisdom. May St. Peter aid us to make our delight, too, in the law of the Lord, and to love it "above gold and the topaz stone" (Ps. cxviii.).

The Gospel (St. Luke xii.) gives our Divine Master's teaching, which St. Peter followed, and, in his turn, taught to those who followed him in his reform. He was one of a little flock; little in the eyes of the world on account of their poverty; little in their own eyes on account of their humility. Yet his Heavenly Father was pleased to give him a kingdom. In this world his kingdom was that of grace over fallen nature, and he ruled as the "strong man who keepeth his court" (St. Luke xi. 21); it was also in the blessing which attended his reformed observance which spread rapidly in the world, and became indeed "a kingdom to God" (cf. Apoc. vi. 10). In heaven St. Peter has received "the kingdom prepared for him" (St. Matthew xxv. 34), for he was one of those of whom the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness spoke, saying: "To him that overcometh, I will give to sit with Me on My throne" (Apoc. iii. 21). His wonderful practice and love of holy poverty, shows how well he had taken to heart the counsel of selling what he had. His gift of contemplation tells us where he had put his treasure, for his conversation was in heaven (cf. Phil. iii. 20), whilst still a wayfarer on earth. How could he take heed of earthly things, when he knew that he would be filled and satisfied only when he saw the King in all His beauty and the land that is very far off? (cf. Isaiah xxxiii. 17). How could he do aught else but despise the world and all it gave, when he

sought for "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven," and "was kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Peter i. 4, 5)? When the "last time" came, at the hour he had foretold, a gracious vision broke on his fading sight, and saintly citizens of heaven came to escort their brother to his true home there, "with joy unspeakable and full of glory, to receive the end of his faith, even the salvation of his soul" (cf. *ibid.*).

The Offertory (Ps. xx.) carries on the picture of the eternal happiness of the saint which he has won by fulfilling the counsels of the Gospel. If by the might of God he had rejoiced on earth, and exulted in the thought of the salvation he hoped for, how much more now does he in the light of glory rejoice, for faith is changed to vision, and hope has given place to possession. The consuming desire of his heart, "to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23), Whom not having seen yet he loved (cf. St. Peter, *loc cit.*), and for Whose sake he had counted every earthly gain as loss, has now been granted to him. Length of days has been given to him in the land of the living, and his salvation has been shown to him (cf. Ps. xc.), and he has entered into possession of the treasure upon which his heart had been set. His desire had been to eat the Eternal Pasch with his Lord, and to sup with Him (Apoc. iii. 20); and his gracious Master has made him come in and sit down with Him in His kingdom, and passing ministers unto him (cf. St. Luke xii. 37) of the delights of eternal reward. Well might St. Peter say to St. Theresa, just after his death: "Oh, happy penance, which has obtained for me so great a reward!"

We pray in the Secret "by the oblation of our lowliness," that our sacrifice may, in honour of St. Peter, be pleasing to God, and purify us here below in both body and soul. When we think of what we are, and of the awful mystery we are going to work, how can we help being abased with sentiments of the deepest humility, and filled with a desire of cleansing our soul and body from aught that can sully the purity our ministry demands? St. Peter's example shows us how to do this. By the practice of holy mortification we

can create within us that new man, which is according to God in justice and holiness of truth ; and put off the old man, who is corrupted according to the desires of error (cf. Eph. iv. 22-24).

In the Communion (St. Matthew xix.), the thought of the “reward exceeding great” is put before us again, as though to cheer us on in the struggle against flesh and blood. It is a hundred-fold here below ; for the peace of God, which surpasses understanding, keeps our heart and mind in Jesus Christ” (Phil. iv. 7) ; and in heaven the joy of the Lord for ever. These were and are the reward of St. Peter ; and they are ours, too, if we will but take them. Listen how our divine Guest speaks in his low still voice at this moment. He, “the great Amen,” swears by Himself, if we, with generous love and burning faith, give up all things, and follow Him along the Way of the Cross, we shall taste even now of the joys He has laid up for them that love Him (cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9). In the Post-Communion we pray that we may have, through St. Peter’s prayers, strength from the Heavenly Food we have fed upon, so to run that we may obtain the prize (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24).

THE COMMON OF A CONFESSOR BISHOP: MASS “STATUT.”  
(St. Charles, C.P., November 4th.)

Jesus, the Redeemer of all, and Crown of Bishops (cf. *Hymn. ad Laudes*), we are going to offer to the Most High Majesty, in answer to Holy Church’s invitation, “Come, let us adore the King of Confessors” (*ad Mat.*). To-day our Eucharistic Sacrifice is in honour of Milan’s great bishop—“he, the Confessor of the Lord, worshipping whom the people through the wide world piously do praise (cf. *Hymn. ad Mat.*) ; and we will pray the great “Prince of Pastors” (2 Pet. v. 4), graciously to grant us to follow in St. Charles’s footsteps, and through his prayers receive the pardon of our sins (cf. *Hymn. ad Mat.*).

The Introit (Eccli. xliv.) is from the praises of the holy fathers ; for the Catholic Bishop is the heir of all the promises and blessings made to the patriarchs. “The Lord hath appointed to him the covenant of peace, and hath made him



a prince, that there should be to him the priestly dignity for ever. "Remember, O Lord, David and all his meekness" (Ps. cxxxi.). The great reformer after God's own heart, St. Charles, was chosen from all eternity, as one who should give to the Church a model of all priestly perfection. A priest is one who has committed to him the covenant of peace, or "the ministry of reconciliation," as St. Paul calls it (2 Cor. v. 18); for "he is appointed in those things that appertain to God" (Heb. v. 1), to offer sacrifice for the living and the dead; to give to the one eternal peace, and to the other the peace the world cannot give. He is "the dispenser of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1), and through Him come "the things which are to the peace of Jerusalem" (Ps. cxxi.); and the covenant is made to him by "the Blood shed for the remission of sins" (St. Matthew xxvi. 28). Throughout St. Charles's busy life the wonderful ideal of the Christian priesthood is set before us in its many-sided aspects, and we can see how fittingly the Church applies to him the opening words of the Introit. Like a true pastor he was always seeking to bring his flock into the covenant of peace with God. No one did more than he to restore to the clergy their "princely spirit." A "prince" himself by birth and position, and a thousand times more a prince by the only dignity worth having, of being by grace a son of God, Who is the "King of kings," and therefore being "a co-heir with the Christ," Who is "the Prince of Peace," and on Whose shoulders is the government of all things (cf. Is. ix. 6). The dignity of the priesthood once given to St. Charles is ever his, for he shares in the ineffable Priesthood of Him Who is "for ever a Priest after the order of Melchisedech" (Ps. cix.). Why in the Psalm is God called upon to remember David and his meekness? Is there any connection to be found between the holy king and St. Charles? It is perhaps chiefly to be found in David's desire to build the house of the Lord, "as he swore to the Lord, and made a vow to the God of Jacob" (Ps. cxxxi. 2), and in the meekness wherewith he bore all the labour, fatigue, affliction, and contradiction in his pious hope of "finding a place for the

Lord, and a dwelling-place for the God of Jacob" (*ibid.* x. 6). It is perhaps chiefly to be found in St. Charles's marvellous life of labour in rebuilding the broken walls of our Sion, and in purifying the desecrated sanctuary; and in the meekness in which he met all the constant affliction and strife until in him the beatitude was fulfilled, and he possessed the land the Vicar of Christ had appointed to him, and in peace his sheep knew him and heard his voice.

The Collect is proper, and should often be on our lips, if we seek to "walk worthy of our calling" (Eph. iv. 1) and have a great love for our Holy Mother. In the course of the Mass we will find many allusions to that "pastoral solicitude" which made St. Charles so glorious; and these ought to fill our sluggish hearts with shame at the remembrance of the heedless way we fulfil the ministry of reconciliation given us.

The Epistle is from the same Book as the Introit, and is taken from the praises of Noe, "the perfect and just," of Abraham "the faithful," of Moses "the law-giver," and of Aaron the "great High Priest;" for a bishop should have the characteristics of all these holy patriarchs. St. Charles was truly a great priest, who in the midst of evil days was found, like Noe, perfect and just; and in the time of wrath, when God's anger had stricken Milan, the holy archbishop made reconciliation by offering himself as the victim for the sins of his people, and showing them the true Ark of Salvation. One loves to think of the picture of this true shepherd of the sheep, going bare-footed in penitential procession through the streets of his city, bearing a heavy cross, and having a rope round his neck as though he were the guilty criminal. Like another Abraham, none were found so zealous as he for the Law of God, none so obedient. Like another Moses, he was the law-giver of his time; and the Church lives to-day in the work that he accomplished during the Council of Trent; and his synodical legislation is the model for all bishops. For three hundred years have the blessing of all nations followed him for the work he then did, and the Church looks upon him as the heaven-sent Nehemias who built up the broken places

in the walls of our Sion, as the Esdras who revived the law, as the High Priest Simon who fortified the temple and honoured the vesture of holiness. God made His approval known by the blessings He gave His servant. He was made a type of His own mercy ; and our mind loves to dwell on the saint dispoiling himself of his heritage to give it all to the poor, and stripping his house of its furniture to help them. How beautiful too is the picture of St. Charles going through the streets and slums of his city administering the sacraments to the dying lest the least one of them should perish ; and of the Pastor in his visitations going through unheard-of toil and difficulty in order to reach some of the lambs who had strayed from the fold. He was like another Aaron, for the mark of God's predilection was on him, and the sign of the Covenant was the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. He was made blessed not only by having the dignity of the priest, but also by making himself like the Great Pastor also a victim, so as to be able to enter more fully into the sacrifice that was offered by his hands. This was the secret of his life of perpetual mortification and penance whereby he conformed himself to the image of his Master. This spirit of sacrifice was the way in which " he fulfilled the priesthood ;" he knew no other manner of being " another Christ " than of being a victim also of his priesthood. Thus gave he honour to God and offered Him the sweet-smelling incense of a life of perpetual prayer.

The Gradual sings the praises of this great Priest, and sets him before us as our model. What is the use of our priesthood unless we please God by using the talent He has given us ? It is now, *in diebus nostris*, that we can please Him ; for does He not say, " Work ye whilst it is day " (St. John ix. 4) ? St. Charles, so it is said, was wont to say each morning *nunc capi*, as though he would stir up his resolution to serve God, and as though all the past had been lost time. The secret of his excellence was that he kept the Law of God. How easy is it to please God ; and yet all that God demands is, " If you love Me keep My commandments " (St. John xiv. 15). Again, St. Charles knew that he was a priest after the order of Melchisedech

“without father or mother, without genealogy, without length of days” (Heb. vii. 3) ; so, as he held not his dignity by any family ties but was “called of God” (*ibid.* v. 4), he would not suffer his relations in any way to interfere in the performance of the duties laid upon him, or in the disposal of the great revenues which came to him from ecclesiastical sources. His high connection by blood with the reigning pontiff would have procured him many dispensations and exemptions; but the pastor’s heart would have none of these, for his priesthood was “without genealogy;” and it owed nothing, and could get nothing, from flesh and blood. It was eternal, and therefore needed all his application, all the attention of his soul; he lived “to fulfil the priesthood;” and to be a good priest was the one object and soul absorbing thought of his life.

In the Gospel (St. Matthew xxv.) we have our Lord’s description of St. Charles as the servant to whom many talents had been given, and who had faithfully traded with the same, and is now rewarded with the joy of his Lord. Many worldly talents, many spiritual ones also, were given to him; his high position and wealth, his episcopate office, his powers of administration, his love of virtue, his penitential life, with all these he traded so well, never losing time; and as though he knew his time was too short, he lived the lives of many men. Trading, bartering, adding interest to capital in the only way allowed to those whose portion is the Lord, he laid up such treasure for himself that when the Lord called His servant he could show the fulness of virtue, and go to meet Him with the joyful cry, *Ecece Venio* on his lips. Surely he was ready to be greeted with the *Euge serrebone et fidelis*, and to enter into the joy of the Lord he had served so well.

The Offertory (Ps. lxxxviii.) meditates on St. Charles’s priesthood. Like David, God had chosen him out of many to do a special work, and had anointed him with the holy unction of the episcopate, and signed and sealed him as a ruler in His Church. His almighty hands did wonderfully help St. Charles in the performance of his pastoral duties, and especially in his great work of reform. The change he



effected in the Church was so great, that men could only say "This is the change of the right hand of God. It is wonderful in our eyes" (Ps. lxxvi. 11). God's arm came to him in the way of miracles, as it did wonderfully help him when a wicked man shot at the saint kneeling in prayer: the bullet was stopped in its course, and fell harmless against the rochet of the holy bishop. It was God's arm supported St. Charles along the path of heroic sanctity wherein his feet were set, and in the zeal which consumed him; it was God's arm which helped him to perform his priesthood; and it is God's arm which he wields now in heaven on our behalf. We are now about to do the great act of priesthood, and may fittingly recall that, like St. Charles, God has found us out amongst many, made us His servants, anointed us with His holy unction, and helps us with the grand grace of Orders to perform our ministry. His arm is ever ready for us in any need. "He hath made us to our God a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign on the earth" (Apoc. vi. 10).

In the Secret we pray that the saints may always make us glad by the thought, surely, that we have the same fulness of means of grace as they had: that redemption is as plentiful for us as for them; that God is as rich in mercy for us as He was for them, and will make us run in the way of the Commandments, as they did, if we will only do as they did, give Him our hearts to widen. We have St. Charles's intercession as well as his example. He looks down from his throne in heaven upon the scene of his past labours, and sees us going along the same weary way, struggling with the same difficulties, with the same enemies as he did; so his charity is moved towards us, and he prays that we may have the common sense to use those very same means, which are so abundantly provided for us, and with which he conquered kingdoms and attained the promises.

The Communion (St. Luke xii.) is our dearest Lord's words of praise of St. Charles, and He whispers to us, in the recesses of our heart, that we too are His servants, and must be faithful dispensers of His mysteries (*loc. cit.*), and prudent rulers over the portion of the vineyard appointed to

us. We, like St. Charles, are each, in our measure and degree, set over God's family to feed them with the Wheat of the elect, which is even now springing up in our heart to an eternal harvest; we have to break to them the Bread of life; taking heed, as true pastors, of the little ones of Christ; and, if need be, following our saint's example, expose ourselves to all manner of dangers for the safety of our flock. Two divine voices are there for our meditation. They contain two directions for the fulfilment of our duty *faithfully* and *prudently*; and with them are two promises of reward: "Be thou *faithful* unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Apoc. ii. 10); and "Lo! My servant shall deal *prudently*, and shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high" (Is. lii. 13).

May we, prays the Post-Communion, in making our thanksgiving for the gifts received in this Mass, receive through St. Charles's prayers, the higher graces of life eternal, which is the destined fruit of Holy Communion. So will we, if like him we set about in earnest to use our present graces. *Et dñi: nunc capì. hæc est mutatio de tris Dei (loc. cit.).*

#### APPENDIX.—THE MASS FOR THE DEAD.<sup>1</sup>

##### "MISSA QUOTIDIANA."

In the Office and Mass for the Dead our Holy Mother has two objects in view, and is "an example to believers in charity" (1 Tim. iv. 12). She prays for her departed children, and she seeks to bring the truest comfort to the bereaved. "Love is as strong as death" (Cant. viii. 6); and though death may take away our loved ones, yet love can follow them, love can aid them, love can be with them still, "for many waters cannot quench it" (*ibid.* 7). Hence our Holy Mother would teach us that the true consolation for mourners is to be found in prayers for the dead, in working for them, in forgetting ourselves as far as can be; for

<sup>1</sup>As we are in the Month of the Holy Souls, we venture to give a slight study of the every-day Mass for the Dead, and humbly beg our readers to have the charity to be mindful of our own beloved dead.—E. L. T.

true "charity seeketh not her own . . . and never faileth" (1 Cor. xiii. 5-8).

The Introit brings many thoughts to our mind. "The rest eternal" is that "rest which remaineth for the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9); that "glorious rest" of which Isaias speaks (xi. 10), where "the weary rest" (*ibid.* xxviii. 12); the "rest which in all things have I sought" (Ecc. xxiv. 11), and can find nowhere, save in God, Whose gift it is; the rest which is the true Sabbath of God (Exod. xxxv. 2); "the rest of the Lord thy God" (Deut. v. 14). The holy souls have not yet gained it; they are working out their salvation, though no longer in fear and trembling, for they have seen the King in His beauty; but in toil and punishment, in the sweat of their brow, do they eat of the bread of affliction (Gen. iii. 19); "for the hand of the Lord hath touched them" (Job xix. 21). So Holy Church, our pitiful mother, implores her Spouse to give her suffering children the rest which sons look for in their loving Father's house. "The light eternal" is the silver side of the dark cloud which hangs over the kingdom of purgatory, and is the effulgence of the Eternal Sun of Justice. They are now in the outer darkness, away from the face of the Beloved; and they call to us from their Seir, "What of the night? will the darkness soon pass?" (Is. xxi. 11); and the grave chant of the Introit breaks in gentle tones on their ears, and gives them the answer: "The morning cometh . . . If ye will ask, ask ye; return, come" (*ibid.* 12). The morning is coming for them when the last farthing is paid, and the day breaks, and the shadows flee away; when, after their exile, Mary shows unto them the blessed fruit of her womb. We, by our prayers and Masses, may hasten their going into that light wherein they shall see light" (Ps. xxxv. 10), and shall be girt about with it as with a vesture (Ps. ciii. 2); and the fullness of joy will come to them with the morning (Ps. xxx. 5). What is the hymn which becometh the Lord in Sion? It is the new song the ransomed sing for ever before the throne, for they have come out of much tribulation: "Salvation to our God, Who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb." There, in the heavenly Jerusalem, they pay their vows to

the Lord, "and serve Him day and night in His temple; and He that sitteth upon the throne shall dwell over them. The Lamb . . . shall rule them, and shall lead them to the fountains of the waters of life; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes" (Apoc. vii. 10, 15, 17). Oh, happy thought! to Him cometh all flesh; and none that will come to Him will He cast out. This thought of the reward exceeding great that is laid up for His children makes Holy Church redouble her prayers that rest eternal and light perpetual may soon be reached by the holy souls.

The Collects are three in number, and are placed in due order. First we pray for all deceased bishops and priests, according to the words of St. Paul: "Be mindful of those who have ruled over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God" (Heb. xiii. 7). In this prayer there seems to be a very grave and serious lesson given to us priests who are still working for our Master. In it we notice that no petition is made that the departed bishops and priests may be pardoned their sins, but only that they may be added to their brethren in heaven. What is the explanation? Perhaps it may be to teach us that the eternal priesthood demands from us so great a perfection, and so much of the true spirit of the Victim in the days of our ministry, that we are bound to depart from this life without having any sin on our souls. The words *apostolic priests* tell us that all true priests are bound to be apostolic, and conformed in all things, as the apostles were, to their Divine Head. As our spiritual rulers came first, so the order of charity demands that the souls of those near and dear to us, and all those who have done us good, should be specially recommended to God. For them we specially ask our ever-dear and Blessed Lady to "turn to Jesus," and do for them what she did for her other friends at Cana of Galilee—whisper to her Son, "They have no wine"—that wine which maketh glad the heart of man (Ps. civ. 15). We know that in answer to her sweet prayers their want will be supplied, and in their joy and delight our loved ones will find in heaven "that all the best wine has been kept until now." We then pray for all the faithful departed, for the forgotten



dead. None are left out, for all being members of the same body, we are bound to feel for the least if in distress. Thus do we fulfil this weighty obligation.

The Lesson is from the vision of the latter things seen by St. John in his place of exile. The voice that told him to write "Blessed are the dead," must be surely that very voice which came forth from the throne—the Word of God, our blissful Saviour, Who has Himself blessed death, and taken away its sting, by passing through the gates thereof. "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's" (Rome xiv. 8). But in life we may fall away; while if we die with our Father's kiss upon us, no man shall snatch us out of His hand. So blessed indeed are the departed in the Lord! And why? For the reason, says the Holy Ghost, for their earthly labours are over, and rest awaits them, and their works follow them. What a generous Master is ours! We come into this world claiming nothing but sin as our own, and He lets us take with us out of the world the good works we have done, and lets us count them as our own. He rewards us for doing what is only our bounden duty. He who sowed in tears reaps in joy: entering this world, he goes his way weeping and casting the seed. But when the day of the harvest-home comes, he returns in joy to the God Who made him, bearing the sheaf of good works, and knows that as he has worked so will he be rewarded.

The Gradual is the same prayer for rest and light as in the Introit. Three times does Holy Church during this Mass use it as though she would persist in her prayer and teach us to tire not till all her children are taken out of the prison-house into their kingdom. The just is held in eternal remembrance not only for a while here below where the fragrance of his virtues linger awhile after his death, but also in heaven, where God never forgets him, where the reward never ceases, and the joy never fades. No evil tidings of change or any such thing can reach him there, for "time shall be no more" (Apoc. x. 6), and He Who sits upon the throne makes all things new (*ibid.* xx. 5). Unwearied in her desire for the welfare of her children, the Church prays for them all, that the bonds of sin which holds them back

from the possession of God may drop off them, and the eternal justice be fully satisfied. She prays that they may escape the judgment of vengeance which demands that the last farthing should be paid by the guilty, and pleads that the power of divine grace may come to their aid and supply for their deficiencies. This grace is none other than Jesus Himself Who is made the propitiation for our sins (1 John ii. 2), and Who bears the chastisement of our peace (Is. liii. 5).

In the wonderful Sequence of Thomas de Celano the Last Judgment is set before us in soul-stirring verse. David's witness seems to refer to the last verses of the second Psalm: "Serve the Lord with fear . . . Embrace discipline lest at any time the Lord be angry, and ye perish from the just way when His wrath shall be kindled in a short time" (11, 12, 13). St. Paul tells us that at the Last Day "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise again" (1 Cor. xv. 52). And St. John writes: "I saw the dead, both great and small, standing before the throne, and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the Book of Life (the *Liber Scriptus in quo totum continetur*) ; and the dead were judged by these things that were written in the books, according to their works" (Apoc. xx. 12). Then shall the Lord "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (1 Cor. iv. 5), and mete out to all according to their works. Then, mindful that "he who thinketh himself to stand should take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. x. 12), the Church puts on the lips of the priest a fervent prayer to "the King of tremendous Majesty," and reminds Him that His salvation is His own adorable free choice ; and, implores Him as the Fount of Kindness, to save him. We then go on to recall to Him "the *kind* Jesus," that it was for the very purpose of saving us that He came down from heaven ; that He sought after us even as He sought after that poor Samaritan's soul when He sat weary by the well-side, and found there in bringing salvation to her the meat and drink which was to His taste. Then we plead the merits of His Sacred Passion, and beg for the gift of forgiveness before the day of reckoning comes ; with crimson brow of shame we confess our guilt, but take heart from the

remembrance of the forgiven Magdalen and the penitent thief. In humble accents we confess that eternal flames are our due; but, trusting in our Saviour's goodness, we pray that we may be found on the right hand among the sheep, and hear the sweet invitation, "Come ye blessed." As a sinner what can we do but pray as a suppliant for a contrite heart; and if God gives us this we are quite contented to leave the care of our end in His hands. The thought of the Last Judgment, and of man standing awaiting his sentence, comes before us once more; so, with a last overwhelming cry for mercy, we conclude with those most touching words, "O kind Jesus, Lord! give to them rest! Amen." This is the second time in the Sequence Jesus is directly called "kind;" and this reminds us that even in judgment He remembereth mercy (cf. Hab. iii. 2.).

Death is only the passage to life eternal, so in the Gospel (St. John vi.) our Lord tells us that we are to obtain this life by feeding on His Body and Blood. "I am the Living Bread," that is the Bread which contains the fulness and source of real life. In Holy Communion Jesus comes to us as "the Bread making strong the heart of man" (Ps. cii.), "the Bread which healeth all our infirmities" (Ps. ciii.); the Bread which gives us true life, increases and perfects it, and plants in us the seeds of immortality. Thus we see how by eating this Bread of Life we live forever—for, as regards our soul, it keeps us in a state of grace, and able to "resist all the fiery darts of the most wicked one" (Eph. vi. 16), until we come to the life of glory which has no end but is one long communion with God. As regards our body; it is the pledge of its glorious resurrection, as became that which has so often "the Ark of Sanctification" (Ps. cxxxi. 8). It is well that the thought of the glorious immortality that awaits us on the other side of the grave should be brought before us during the Mass for the Dead, for nothing can console those who weep for a loved one, "who has gone before in the sign of faith, and sleeps in Christ" (*vide Canon Missæ*) than the remembrance of the two last articles of our Baptismal Creed: "I believe in the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." Our Lord then tells us the secret of it all, and shows us how we can rejoin those for whom we mourn. Holy

Communion is the way ; and not only will it take us to the abiding city, but He the only Consoler, will pour the oil and wine into our bleeding hearts ; and, lavishing His love upon us, will make it sweet to say, although overcome by sorrow : "Thy will be done." How can we mistrust His plain words : "He who eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, *has* eternal life" ? We have it now already as our very own, for life eternal is "to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23) ; and we *are* with Him, and He with us, in Holy Communion.

The Offertory is a wonderful passage of great power and vividness. The Church puts the dead before us as though they were just on the point of departing this life. How sweetly the name of Jesus comes in at once ; it re-echoes the "Kind Jesus" of the Sequence, just as the "King of glory" recalls the "King of tremendous majesty," whom we called in the same verse, "the Fount of Kindness." Cast them not into the abyss ; let not the outer darkness and pains of hell be for them ; nor let the cruel enemy who like a roaring lion waits to devour them, prevail over them ; but let Holy Michael, the leader of the heavenly army, the one who bears the standard with its emblazoned device, "Who is like to God," rebuke his old adversary, and bring the souls into the holy light where God dwelleth, and there fulfil the promises made on their behalf to the Father of the Faithful. This refers us without doubt to the Promised Land, the type of the true Canaan. "All the land thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever" (Gen. xiii. 15). The "Holy Light" reminds us of that "smoking furnace and a burning lamp that passed between the pieces" of Abraham's mystic sacrifice (Gen. xv. 17), when the Promise was again made. We offer to God "hosts and prayers of praise" in thanksgiving for His boundless mercy towards the departed, and for the loving kindness with which He treats those for whom we pray. Make them pass, O Lord, from death to life, to the life which Thou of old didst promise to Abraham and to his seed ! We have had one reference to the Holy Light and now to the life. They are two aspects of the same truth that God lives in Light. Here the promise made to Abraham does not refer, as it does in the first instance, to the Light of Glory, but to the possession of God which is



the cause of true life : " for with Thee there is the well of life," says the Royal Singer of Israel (Ps. xxxv. 10). The promise of this life was made to Abraham in these words : " Fear not . . . I am thy reward exceeding great " (Gen. xv. 1); and to his seed : " I will be their God " (*ibid.* xvii. 8).

In the Secrets we notice in the first only a very indirect reference to any detention in purgatory of those who have had the priestly merit. It seems as though Holy Church would impress on us the fact that no priest ought to go to purgatory, but straight to the fellowship of God's saints. In the second prayer we base our humble petition on God's mercies, which are numberless, and beg that by this Sacrifice of Salvation our friends may obtain the remission of all their sins. In the third we note that faith is the ground for the reward, as the Apostle says, " The just man lives by faith " (Rom. i. 17).

In the Communion we have the oft-repeated prayer for rest and light, with the touching addition, " because Thou art kind." Again the echo of the *Pie Jesu* of the Sequence. Can He resist our prayers now that He has come to us with all His treasures, and we ask nothing but what is pleasing to Him ?

The first of the Post-Communion prayers reminds God that His priests have hoped and believed in Him. We should indeed be men of hope and faith, for to us there is given the ministry of reconciliation, and we are the dispensers of God's mysteries. In the second prayer, which is for our own dead, we remember that the Mass we have just said is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God Who has called into His presence those who have gone before us. May they soon, by the power of this sacrifice, attain to the happiness of eternal rest. In the third all God's servants and handmaidens are remembered, that they may be freed from sin ; that the number of the elect may be made up ; and that they may be sharers in His redemption : " for with Him there is plentiful redemption," abundant for all ; " to every one that thirsteth I will give of the fountain of the waters of life gratis . . . and I will be his God, and he shall be My son " (Apoc. xxi. 6, 7).

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

(*To be continued.*)

## Liturgical Questions.

---

### I.

#### THE NEW DECREE AFFIRMING THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FEASTS.

This decree settles for ever a very old and very well-known liturgical controversy, a brief notice of which may prove interesting to our readers. In occurrence and concurrence, as well as in the transfer of feasts, two qualities of the feasts are to be attended to. These are the *rite* under which the feast is celebrated, and the *dignity* of the saint or mystery commemorated by the feast. The general rule then is, that if the feasts are of unequal rite, the one of higher rite takes precedence, in occurrence, concurrence, and transfer; and if they are of equal rite, but of unequal dignity, the one of higher dignity takes precedence. Feasts of our Lord, and of the Blessed Virgin are, of course, of higher dignity than the feasts of saints. Consequently, according to the general rule, the former should take precedence of the latter when both are of the same rite. In this general rule, drawn from the rubrics of the Brevary, no reference is made to primary and secondary feasts, nor indeed is any trace of such a distinction to be found in the rubrics. But almost immediately after the publication of the corrected and improved recension of the rubrics by Clement VIII., some liturgical writers began to make this distinction, and to teach that primary feasts should always take precedence of secondary feasts of the same rite though of higher dignity. According to this opinion, a secondary feast of our Lord or of the Blessed Virgin should yield to a primary feast of a saint if both feasts were of the same rite. The opinion gained ground, chiefly owing to the authority of Merati, who embraced and defended it; but there were not wanting able opponents, chief of whom was Cavalieri. The Congregation of Rites was frequently asked for a definite solution of the question, but contented itself with merely deferring a reply, or else made the reply refer only to a particular case. It must be said, however, that the replies of the Congregation

favoured the opinion of Merati and his followers, which the decree we now publish fully approves and confirms.

This decree will have a marked influence on our Irish Directory. For the present compilers, following the example of their venerable and learned predecessor, have not admitted the distinction between primary and secondary feasts unless in the two or three cases in which the Congregation of Rites have declared that such a distinction existed. Feasts of our Lord and of the Blessed Virgin have in all cases been given precedence over the feasts of saints of the same rite. We will illustrate this by a few references to the Directory for the present year.

Saturday, September 9, is the feast of St. Kyran, of double major rite; the following day is the feast of the Holy Name of Mary, also of double major rite, and, as will be seen by referring to the Directory, the Vespers of Saturday are of the feast of the Holy Name with a commemoration merely of St. Kyran. Now the feast of St. Kyran is a primary feast, this being his *dies natalitia vel quasi natalitia*, while the feast of the Holy Name of Mary is given in the subjoined list as a secondary feast. Hence should these two feasts concur again in the same manner, the vespers will be entirely of St. Kyran, with only a commemoration of the feast of the Holy Name. The feasts celebrated on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th of the same month (September) afford a similar illustration. The feast of our Lady of Ransom, a secondary feast, as we now see, comes between two primary feasts of the same rite, all three being of double major rite. The feast of the Blessed Virgin, has, however, both first and second Vespers complete, while the preceding and following feasts get merely a commemoration. In future the reverse of this will take place. The preceding feast will have second Vespers complete, and the following will have first Vespers complete, with, in each case, only a commemoration of the feast of our Lady of Ransom. Many similar examples could be pointed out, but the foregoing are sufficient to illustrate the principle hitherto adopted in compiling the Directory for Ireland, and which must now be abandoned. The

following is the decree referred to, published as may be seen on July 2nd of the present year. The catalogue of primary and secondary feasts will be found among the *Documents* in the present issue of the I. E. RECORD.

DECRETUM GENERALE DE PRAEEMINENTIA INTER FESTA  
PRIMARIA ET SECUNDARIA EIUSDEM RITUS.

*Die 27 Iunii, 1893.*

Iamdudum apud viros sacrae liturgiae peritos quaestio agebatur, gravissimi sane momenti, quoad praecminentiam inter festa primaria et secundaria eiusdem ritus. Verum, hac controversia nondum composita, identidem Sacra Rituum Congregatio peculiaribus in casibus responsa dedit, ac plura particularia edidit Decreta, quin unquam rem per generale Decretum definiret. Quum vero hisce postremis temporibus in eiusmodi quaestione maxima esset discrepantia ex multiplici atque opposita penes scriptores sacrae liturgiae Rubicarum interpretatione; necessarium duxit Apostolica Sedes unicam tandem normam statuere, quae ubique et ab omnibus, praesertim in ordine Divini Officii uniformiter redigendo, servaretur. Quocirca Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII. commisit R. P. D. Augustino Caprara, S. Fidei Promotori, ut votum *ex officio* exararet, in Ordinariis Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Comitibus discutiendum; posteaquam diversae ea de re a viris in Rubricarum scientia peritis habitae fuerunt sententiae, elucubrationibus multa eruditione exornatis.

Quibus omnibus praelo cussis, communicatisque una cum voto praelati S. Fidei Promotoris, in Ordinario Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Coetu, subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunato, a me infrascripto Cardinali eidem Sacra Congregationi Praefecto et Relatore, sequens Dubium propositum fuit, videlicet: *An festa secundaria Domini B. Mariae Virg. Angelorum Ss. Apostolorum aliorumque Sanctorum praeferenda sint festis Primariis eiusdem ritus et classis, sed minoris personalis dignitatis, tam in occurso quam in concursu, et in eorundem repositione?*

Itaque Eminentissimi Patres sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositi, mature perpensis rationibus tum a memoratis viris, tum a R. P. D. Promotore S. Fidei adductis, ita rescribendum censuerunt: *In voto R. P. D. Promotoris Fidei, nimirum: Festa Primaria utpote solemniora, aliis secundariis in casu praeferenda esse tam in occurso quam in concursu, ad formam Rubricae X. de Transiitione festorum n. 6. Quod si eadem festa transferri contingat, in illorum repositione servetur ordo praescriptus in memorata Rubrica n. 7; et fiat cata'gus festorum, quae uti Primaria, vel secundaria retinenda sunt.* Die 27 Iunii, 1893.

Demum his omnibus Sanctissimo eidem Domino Nostro relatis per me ipsum infrascriptum Cardinalem Praefectum,



Sanctitas Sua sententiam eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis ratam habuit, et confirmavit, iussitque ita, non aliter Rubricarum praescripta hac in re esse interpretanda: Rescripta, seu Decreta, tum generalia tum particularia, in contrarium facientia, suprema auctoritate sua penitus abrogando. Die 2 Iulii, anno eodem.

CAIETANUS Card. ALOISI-MASELLA,  
*S. R. C., Praefectus.*

Loco ✠ Sigilli.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI,  
*S. R. C., Secretarius.*

## II.

### DECREE GRANTING A NEW OFFICE AND MASS IN HONOUR OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

It will be a source of sincere pleasure to all who are engaged in propagating or in practising the new devotion to the Holy Family, to learn that our Holy Father has given a still further proof of the lively interest he takes in this devotion. He had already, in the most solemn manner, approved of this devotion, and blessed it; and, in words of burning eloquence, exhorted the pastors and people of Christendom to be assiduous in practising it; he had, moreover, enriched it from the Treasury of the Church with many indulgences, and had granted various privileges to all who should faithfully practise it; and now he has crowned all these by granting a new Office and Mass of the Holy Family. The subjoined decree hardly requires explanation; still a few words may not be out of place.

In the first place, as is evident from the terms of the decree, this Office and Mass are not made obligatory on the clergy of any country, nor is it even lawful for a priest to depart from the diocesan Directory and recite this Office and Mass on the day to which it has been fixed. The first step must be taken by the bishops. On the application of a bishop to the Congregation of Rites, this Office will be granted to his diocese, and should thenceforth take its place in the diocesan calendar, when it becomes obligatory on the priests of the diocese, like all the other Offices given in the calendar.

Secondly, the day to which the new Office is assigned is the third Sunday after Epiphany. The Sunday within the

Octave of the Epiphany had already been appointed as a day for specially honouring the Holy Family; but as that day would not admit an Office of the rite assigned to this one, and as the second Sunday after Epiphany is the Feast of the Holy Name, the third had to be selected. Though of double major rite, this Office does not enjoy, as a matter of course, the privilege of being transferred when impeded. It would be well then, when petitioning for the Office, to ask to have this privilege attached to it, otherwise it will sometimes have to be reduced to the simple rite, and merely commemorated. For it sometimes happens, as it does next year, that the third Sunday after Easter is one of the privileged Sundays. The following is the decree:—

DECRETUM. DE NOVO OFFICIO ET MISSA S. FAMILIAE.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII. Consociationem a Sancta Familia, quae laetus atque uberes fructus iam in Ecclesia ferebat, per Litteras diei XIV. Iunii superioris anni eo salutari consilio approbavit, ut familiae christianae pretiori pietas Lexu Sanctae eidem Familiae devinceretur, et Iesus, Maria ac Ioseph familias sibi deditas tamquam eam propriam tenerent ac foverent. Quo vero inter fideles cultus erga eandem Sanctam Familiam in dies augeatur, plurimi amplissimi diversarum nationum Episcopi ipsi Sanctissimo Domino Nostro humillimis precibus supplicarunt, ut, quemadmodum iam in aliquibus locis obtinebat, Officium et Missam in honorem Sanctae Familiae Nazarenae sibi, religiosisque Congregationibus petentibus concedere dignaretur.

Porro, quum in peculiari officio, iamdiu in quibusdam Dioecesisibus adhibito, nonnulla immutatio opus esset; visum fuit novum Officium et Missae schemi conficere, quod reapse de speciali Apostolica Auctoritate confirmatum, et prout in superiori exemplari prostat, per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum, una cum R. P. D. Augustino Caprarā Sanctae Fidei Promotore diligenter revisum, a meipso Cardinali subsignata die eidem Sanctissimo Domino exhibitum fuit. Sanctitas vero Sua illud in omnibus approbare dignata est, benigneque indulsit, ut Festum ipsius Sanctae Familiae cum Officio ac Missa propriis a singulis Sacrorum Antistitibus pro Clero sibi commissae Dioeceseos, atque a religiosis Congregationibus petentibus, sub ritu Duplicis maioris Dominicae III. post Epiphaniam recoli valeat: simulque mandavit, ut in locis ubi huc usque Festum Sanctae Familiae celebratum est, illud praefatae Dominicae III. post Epiphaniam affigatur, novum-

que Officium cum Missa antiquo in posterum substituatur: servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 14 Iunii, 1893.

C. Card. ALOISI-MASELLA,  
*S. R. C., Præfectus.*

L. ✠ S.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI,  
*S. R. C., Secretarius.*

### III.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING THE ERECTION OF A SODALITY OF THE SACRED HEART.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Please answer the following questions in next issue of *I. E. RECORD*, or at your convenience:—

“1st. Certain Fathers give a mission in a parish, and during their visit established [?] the Sodality of the S.S. Heart: they do this without in any special way consulting the Ordinary of the place. Is that sodality canonically established, so as to entitle the members to gain the usual indulgences?

“2nd. The curate of the place simply as a matter of ordinary duty, takes charge of the sodality, but has not been appointed by the bishop. In fact, the bishop knows nothing of the establishment of the society, or of the director's appointment till long afterwards. What about this director? Is he canonically appointed?

“Maurel on Indulgences, Article V., page 188, says: ‘All confraternities and pious congregations are under the jurisdiction of the diocesan. Hence it is his province to authorize, approve, and canonically erect them, &c. Note, too, that confraternities not canonically erected would not be affiliated to the mother or archconfraternities at Rome, and therefore would not participate in the indulgence commonly granted to such societies.’ Again, on page 191, he says: ‘Conformably to a decree of 18th November, the director of a confraternity is nominated by the ordinary.’

“An answer will much oblige yours,

“C. C. DIOEC. ARMACAN.”

1. As a general rule, the bishop of a diocese, and he alone, has the power of canonically erecting confraternities and

sodalities in the diocese.<sup>1</sup> Certain religious Orders, as, for example, the Trinitarians, the Carmelites, the Dominicans, the Servites, can canonically erect in their own churches the confraternities which pertain to their respective Orders without the intervention of the bishop of the place in which the church is situated:<sup>2</sup> but in churches other than their own, they must have the bishop's consent or permission for the erection of even these confraternities. Otherwise the erection would not be canonical. Whether the fathers to whom our correspondent refers, had special powers enabling them to dispense with the permission of the bishop in establishing the Sodality of the Sacred Heart, we cannot, of course, determine, as we do not know to what Order or Congregation the fathers belonged. We may say, however, that we have nowhere seen this sodality mentioned as being among those that are removed from the jurisdiction of the bishop. On the contrary, it would seem to be one of those that are in a special manner subject to him.<sup>3</sup> At any rate, even those privileged confraternities already referred to, cannot be erected by the Orders to which they respectively belong, in a church that is not their own, without consent of the bishop; and we are of opinion that the fathers referred to by our correspondent had, at least, no more extensive privileges than have been granted to the Orders we have mentioned. We are of opinion, therefore, that, at least, a *prima facie* case exists against the canonical erection of this particular Sodality of the Sacred Heart. The *onus* of proving the canonical character of the erection devolves on the fathers who erected it.

2. The answer to the second question would seem to be still plainer than the answer to the first. For whatever

<sup>1</sup> Beringer, ii. Partie, iv<sup>e</sup> Section, § 4, ii. 1. After mentioning one or two exceptions, such as are referred to above, the author proceeds: "Mais il n'en reste pas moins vrai qu'en règle générale l'érection des confréries, ainsi que l'approbation de tout Statut est du nombre de ces affaires plus importantes qui *ex jure scripto et ex causis gravitate* relèvent uniquement de la compétence de l'évêque diocésain," *ibi*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibi*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibi*.

<sup>4</sup> *Vid.* Beringer, l. c. 3.



powers religious may possess for the erection of confraternities and sodalities without the explicit consent of the bishop, it would seem that they have no power at all to appoint a director apart from the case when the sodality is established in one of their own churches. The words of Beringer on this point are clear and explicit: “ Aussitôt qu’ un confrérie vient à être érigée (*serait ce par l’autorité d’un général d’Ordre*) l’évêque doit lui nommer un directeur muni des pouvoirs nécessaires.” The words which we have printed in italics would seem to imply that there is absolutely no exception to this important rule. Again, therefore, we say that the fathers who established this Sodality of the Sacred Heart are called upon to show by what authority they have departed from the general law of the Church.

---

#### IV.

##### QUESTIONS REGARDING INDULGENCED CRUCIFIXES.

“ REV. DEAR SIR,—I am surprised to find in the September Number of the I. E. RECORD a different version of the concession made by the Holy Father in favour of sick people who are unable to recite the prescribed prayers for gaining the indulgences of the Stations of the Cross, with a crucifix blessed for that purpose.

“ The condition contained in the *Instructio de Stationibus S. Viæ Crucis*, published in 1888, is as follows:—‘ Excipiuntur vero ab implenda hac conditione ii, qui gravi morbo, &c. . . . quibus hodiernus P. Minister Generalis, ex benigna concessione ipsi facta a. s. m. Pio Pp. IX., per litteræ in forma Brevis sub die 18 Decembris, 1877, indulget, ut eorum loco recitent semel actum contritionis, *vel* invocationem; Te ergo quaesumus,’ &c., pages 77 and 78.—N.B. I have underlined the word *vel*.

“ On page 853 of the I. E. RECORD for September, the condition differs from the above, being in the following terms:—‘ Indulgemus ut, eorum loco, recitent semel Actum contritionis *et* invocationem; Te ergo quaesumus,’ &c.; to which is added the following, which is not given in the concession of Pius IX., viz. :—‘ Ac mente saltem sequantur recitationem ab alio adstante factam trium Pater, Ave et Gloria.’—N.B. I have underlined the word

*et*. You will notice that the substitution of *et* for *vel* makes a vast difference.

· I am inclined to think that there is a mistake in either one or other of the quotations. I do not think that Leo XIII. would make the condition a more difficult one than that laid down by Pius IX. I have the faculty of attaching the indulgences of the Stations to a crucifix, and so far I have acted on the *Instructio* of 1888, when giving the crucifixes to the sick. I am anxious to learn which formula I am to follow.

“W. L.”

The best reply we can offer to our correspondent is to place before him the full text of the Brief issued by his Holiness Leo XIII. on the subject of his question. We have copied the text of the Brief from the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Tome xxiii., numéro 3, and have taken the liberty of copying also the luminous notes, in which the learned editor of the *Revue* explains the difference between the concession made by the present Pontiff and that made by his predecessor, Pius IX. These notes should remove all doubts from our correspondent's mind.

#### EX SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

REVERENDISSIMO PATRI MINISTRO GENERALI FRATRUM MINORUM  
CIRCA PRIVILEGIUM COMMUTANDI PRECES INJUNCTAS PRO  
ACQUISITIONE INDULGENTIARUM STATIONUM VIAE  
CRUCIS CUM CRUCIFIXO BENEDICTO.

LEO PP. XIII.

DILECTE FILI SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Exponi Nobis curavisti, ex benignitate Apostolica Ministro Generali Ordinis tui pro tempore existenti, aliisque Sacerdotibus tum Secularibus, tum Regularibus ab eo delegatis, privilegium fuisse concessum Crucifixos benedicendi cum applicatione indulgentiarum Viae Crucis, seu Calvariae, ita ut Christifideles, qui legitime impediuntur quominus pium exercitium Viae Crucis, in locis, ubi ipsum rite institutum est, peragere possint, si ante imaginem Crucifixi Redemptoris sic benedictam vicies repetant Orationem Dominicam, salutationem Angelicam, et laudem *Gloria Patri*, eandem Viae Crucis indulgentias adipiscantur. Insuper roganti Decessori tuo Summus Pontifex Pius Nonus rec. mem. litteris xviii Decembris mdccclxxvii benigne concessit, ut ipse, durante munere, gravi morbo laborantibus hanc recitationem in breviores aliquas preces commutare posset. Jamvero cum tu, dilecte fili, similem Nobis adhibueris postulationem. Nos piis

hujusmodi votis tuis obsecundare volentes, tibi facultatem facimus, ut, donec Ministri Generalis Ordinis tui munere fungaris, iis tantum qui, deficientibus gravi morbo viribus, recitandis viginti *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* omnino impares sint, concedere possis, ut eorum loco ad acquirendas indulgentias Viae Crucis, ipsi ore recitent actum contritionis, et invocationem : “ Te ergo quaesumus tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemisti,” et mente saltem sequantur recitationem ab alio adstante factam trium *Pater, Ave, Gloria*.

Non obstantibus nostra, ac Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de non concedendis indulgentiis ad instar, aliisque Constitutionibus, et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris die IX Septembris MDCCCXC, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo tertio.

Pro Dno CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI.

J. ARCHIEP. SELEUCIEN, *Substitutus*.

Il fallait que le nouveau ministre général de l'Observance obtint ce pouvoir ; car le bref accordé à son Prédécesseur était, comme celui-ci, personnel, et valable pour le temps du généralat, seulement. Mais le nouveau bref diffère de l'ancien, et nous devons insister sur ces différences.

Le bref du 18 Décembre 1877 ne déterminait pas les prières à réciter comme commutation des 20 *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* ordinairement imposés à ceux qui se servent d'un crucifix béni pour gagner les indulgences du chemin de la croix ; il donnait pouvoir au Révérendissime Père Général de les déterminer lui-même. Bien plus, il permettait formellement de commuer *en une courte prière* : “ Tibi, dilecte Fili, ut, donec Ministri Generalis tui Ordinis munus exerceas, Christifidelibus utriusque sexus, qui gravi morbo ita afficiuntur, ut praefata pietatis opera ad consequendas indulgentias Viae Crucis nuncupatas praestare nequeant, haec eadem opera in brevem aliquam precationem ante imaginem Sanctissimi D. N. Crucifixi ad id benedictam recitandam, tuo arbitrio ac prudentia commutare libere ac licite possis et valeas, Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica . . . concedimus et impertimus.”

En exécution de ce pouvoir, le Révérendissime Père Général avait déterminé que les malades incapables de réciter 20 *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* les remplaceraient par l'acte de contrition ou par l'invocation : “ Te ergo quaesumus . . . etc.” Voici du reste le texte dont il s'était servi ; nous le trouvons dans les feuilles de pouvoir par lesquelles il déléguaux aux prêtres la faculté de bénir les crucifix avec application des indulgences du chemin de la croix : “ Iis vero, qui gravi morbo ita afficiuntur, ut recitari viginti *Pater Ave* et *Gloria* impares sint, . . . indulgemus ut eorum loco recitent semel Actum contritionis, *vel* invocationem : Te ergo quaesumus,” . . . etc,

Le bref actuel est loin d'accorder dans les mêmes conditions le pouvoir désiré. Ce n'est plus le Révérendissime Père Général qui détermine les prières données en commutation, le Souverain Pontife les a déterminées lui-même. A-t-il pensé qu'un acte de contrition ou l'invocation indiquée était vraiment trop peu pour gagner les indulgences si précieuses du chemin de la croix ? Il est permis de le croire, puisqu'il a imposé davantage ; il veut que le malade ajoute à l'acte de contrition l'invocation : "Te ergo quaesumus . . . etc.," et de plus, dise, ou au moins suive mentalement la récitation de trois *Pater*, *Ave* et *Gloria Patri*, faite par quelqu'un des assistants.

Nous n'avons point à rechercher si cette dernière condition surtout sera commode à remplir dans la pratique ; ordinairement, c'est quand un malade est seul, qu'il aime mieux se recueillir et faire son chemin de croix. Mais le bref est formel, et le Souverain Pontife attache ses faveurs aux conditions qui lui plaisent ; il n'y a donc qu'à s'y conformer.

Mais ici se présente une autre question assez importante dans la pratique. Les concessions anciennes, nous voulons dire les concessions et commutatoires accordées par le précédent ministre général subsistent-elles toujours, ou bien faut-il les regarder comme révoquées ? On voit tout de suite les conséquences de la réponse. Si les commutations anciennes sont révoquées, tous, même les personnes qui ont un crucifix béni en vertu de la délégation donnée par le Révérendissime P. Bernardin, doivent maintenant, pour gagner les indulgences, s'en tenir aux conditions du nouveau bref, c'est-à-dire faire leur acte de contrition, puis réciter l'invocation prescrite, enfin réciter ou faire réciter devant elles les trois *Pater*, *Ave* et *Gloria*. Si au contraire les commutations anciennes subsistent, ces personnes n'ont pas à se préoccuper des conditions nouvelles, et peuvent choisir entre l'acte de contrition et l'invocation : "Te ergo quaesumus" . . . etc.

Nous croyons que les commutations anciennes subsistent, le bref nouveau ne contient pas un seul terme déboutoir ; de plus, les commutations ont été valablement accordées par le Révérendissime P. Bernardin, et pour toujours. Il nous semble donc qu'il ne peut y avoir sous ce rapport de véritable difficulté.

Mais il est évident qu'il ne faut appliquer cette décision qu'aux seuls crucifix bénits avant la mort du Révérendissime P. Bernardin ; tous ceux qui ont été bénits depuis, même en vertu de pouvoirs accordés par lui, ne peuvent donner droit à la commutation ancienne, mais seulement à celle qui sera accordée en vertu du nouveau bref. La raison en est toute simple : c'est que le bref du Révérendissime P. Bernardin, comme le bref actuel, portait la clause ; "Dumque Ministri generalis tui Ordinis munero fungaris." Il prenait donc fin le jour de sa mort.



2. A correspondent signing himself "A. B." writes to us again regarding crucifixes indulgenced for the Way of the Cross. In a former letter, to which we replied in the September number of the I. E. RECORD, he inquired whether persons having crucifixes blessed by the Pope himself, or by Cardinal Melchers, could not gain the indulgence by fulfilling the prescribed conditions even when they could easily visit the Stations of the Cross canonically erected. In our reply we merely stated that we were not aware that the Pope was in the habit of attaching such a privilege to crucifixes blessed by himself, or that he had granted to Cardinal Melchers, or anyone else, the power of doing this. We admitted, of course, that if the Pope did really grant such a privilege, or if he empowered another to grant it, the concession would be valid. Our correspondent now sends us the following instructions printed on a leaflet, a copy of which he says is given in Rome to everyone who gets a crucifix blessed by His Holiness or by Cardinal Melchers; and he argues that, as no mention is made in this leaflet of the use of the crucifix for gaining the indulgence of the Way of the Cross being restricted to persons unable to visit the Stations canonically erected, therefore no such restriction exists. We will first give the document, and then examine it.

En baisant ce Crucifix, béni par le Saint Père, on gagne l'Indulgence Plénière in *Articulo mortis*.

Avec ce même Crucifix on peut gagner toutes les indulgences du *Chemin de la Croix* en récitant dévotement et le cœur contrit quatorze *Pater, Ave, Gloria* en union des stations du *Chemin de la Croix*; cinq autres *Pater, Ave, Gloria* en mémoire des cinq Plaies de N. S. Jesus-Christ, et un *Pater, Ave, Gloria* pour le Souverain Pontife.

Un tel privilège a été accordé à Son Em<sup>ce</sup> le Cardinal Melchers par le Souverain Pontife Pie IX de V. M. et confirmé par S. S. Léon XIII.

Si plusieurs personnes réunies font le *Chemin de la Croix* avec ce même Crucifix, bien qu'une seule tienne dans ses mains celui qui lui appartient, toutes gagnent les Indulgences."

It is true that there is no trace here of restriction or condition referred to; and it seems also true that crucifixes blessed by His Holiness or by Cardinal Melchers possess

greater privileges than those blessed by ordinary priests having the necessary faculties. Otherwise why should reference be made in this document to the special privilege conferred on Cardinal Melchers? Any priest may obtain the power of imparting to crucifixes the indulgence of the Way of the Cross, which indulgence can be gained by those who fulfil the prescribed conditions. What then is the special privilege attaching to crucifixes blessed by the Pope or by Cardinal Melchers? Is it that those who have them may gain the indulgence by reciting the prescribed prayers, even though they can easily and conveniently visit the Stations of the Cross canonically erected? To the last question we unhesitatingly answer in the negative. There is no trace of any exception like this to be found; and the very absence of all mention of such an exception from this document is an argument that the indulgence is to be gained only on the ordinary conditions. We admit, however, that these crucifixes have a special privilege; but that privilege, so far as we can make out, has no reference to the indulgence of the Way of the Cross, but to the plenary indulgence in *articulo mortis*, mentioned in the first paragraph. A similar privilege does not attach to all crucifixes indulgenced for the Way of the Cross, as is fully explained by Beringer in his admirable work on indulgences. Referring to this matter the learned author says among other things: "Parfois aussi pour accorder *une faveur particulière* à certains prêtres le pape benit des crucifix auquel il attache la même indulgence (à l'heure de la mort)."<sup>1</sup>

D. O'LOAN.

<sup>1</sup> iii<sup>e</sup> Partie, iii<sup>e</sup> Section, n 2, x. d., note 1.

## Correspondence.

---

### SEN PATRICK: WHO HE WAS, AND WHO HE WAS NOT.

“DEAR REV. SIR,—I felt some regret at occupying much valuable space in the I. E. RECORD, by my reply to the writer of ‘Sen Patrick,’ as I feared I had needlessly dwelt on the anachronisms and self-contradictions in the alleged Chart of Patrick. It appears, however, that faith in the Chart has not been yet fully shaken in some places. In addition, then, to the anachronisms shown in the allusions to the vulgar era, the use of Arabic numbers, and to the then unheard-of indulgences, I would point out that Pope Celestine, or any Pope of his age, did not send, as stated in the Chart, a mere monk or simple priest to originate a mission amongst the heathen.

“The alleged Sen Patrick is made to say, not very modestly nor truly, that he ‘converted the Irish to the way of truth, and had strengthened them in the Catholic faith.’ Why, when Palladius was sent to Ireland after the alleged Sen Patrick, he found, in the words of the *Book of Armagh*, Ireland ‘bound (spiritually) in wintry rigour;’ and the same venerable Book adds that ‘the beastly and savage Irish did not receive his doctrines.’ And St. Patrick, in his *Confession*, subsequent to Palladius, while thanking God for being chosen an instrument for the conversion of the Irish, stated of them that ‘until now they, who have only worshipped idols and unclean things, have lately become the people of the Lord, and been called the sons of God.’ Yet the alleged Sen Patrick would claim the credit of ‘converting the Irish!’

“That he did not remain in Ireland to gather in the spiritual harvest, appears very strange; the more so as there was room for Roman, British, and Frankish labourers in the vineyard, and as he is represented to have lived forty-one years in Glastonbury after retiring from Ireland. Besides, he lived a healthy life; for, though he found it necessary to grant, as stated (he could not grant), a hundred days’ indulgence to all who would hew a passage through woods to the hill overhanging Glastonbury for the sturdy and fervent pilgrims to the Virgin’s shrine underneath, yet himself, a long time after his arrival in Glastonbury, made his way through the thick

wood to the summit of the unapproachable hill. It is passing strange that the alleged Sen Patrick in such robust health as to have buried the twelve brothers whom he found in Glastonbury, turned his back on the Irish mission during forty-one years. The Glastonbury chroniclers are not correct in stating that Sen Patrick left the Irish mission in the year 433, for Palladius was sent in the year 431, and had as successor our national saint in the year 432. But this is a very small thing in comparison to other statements which we are called on to believe:

“The views of the learned writer of ‘Sen Patrick’ are contradicted by all Irish chroniclers and annalists—by the *Psalter of Cashel*, the *Book of Leinster*, the *Book of Lecan*, and the *Annals of Connought*—who state Sen Patrick to have been a bishop. These, with the *Annals of Ulster*, and the *Chronicon Scotorum* place his death before that of our national saint. Our writer differs not only from all these, but even with himself, in stating, in one page, that Sen Patrick died before our national saint, and, in the next page, that our national saint died before him. To be sure, he had the authority of the ancient Irish scholiast for this blunder; but if he had read all that has been written on Sen Patrick, the blunder would have been avoided.

“This late and unsupported theory on Sen Patrick receives contradiction not only from Irish writers, but even from Glastonbury chroniclers. These claim the honour of having not merely a monk or simple priest as their first abbot, but the archbishop of the Irish, who, as stated, was educated at Auxerre, under Germanus, and was sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland. In proof of this, miracle and vision and heavenly dreams are adduced. Without dwelling on miraculous afflictions and their equally preternatural cure, we are to consider that one monk dreamt a dream, and that another saw a vision, in which St. Patrick, Archbishop of Ireland, appeared and assured them of his stay once on a time, and of his death in Glastonbury. Now, if the writer of ‘Sen Patrick’ has faith in these writings, why contradict them?

“If, on the other hand, he turns to Irish writers, he finds no support. He states that our national saint preached in Ireland only thirty years, whereas the first Life, the *History of France*, allows sixty years. He states that Sen Patrick lived after our national saint, whereas they state the contrary.

“The writer of ‘Sen Patrick,’ in order to connect him with



Glastonbury, quotes a quatrain from *Ængus's Festology*. It is given by our writer, under the 24th August, as follows :—

‘ With the relation of the host of Srenath (Glastonbury)  
Whose history is made illustrious,  
Sen Patrick, a battle-chief,  
The amiable preceptor of our sage.’

“ Now, with regard to the first line, none of three versions of the *Festology* would support the reading *Srenath*, whereas the *Laud* and *L. Breac* versions clearly point to Zenotius, who, at the head of one hundred and fifty or one hundred and fifty-three martyrs in Carthage, were thrown into a burning mass of lime, and were called the white mass. They were commemorated under the 24th August, though alluded to by the scholiast under the 25th, and were immortalized in the verses of Paulinus of Nola. I would then substantially admit the rendering by Mr. W. Stokes, who, however, does not appear to understand to what reference is made :—

“ With the heap of Zenobius’ [?] host, &c.’

However, it matters very little, as regards the question on hands, which is the correct reading ; for if the text does not allude to Glastonbury, the scholiast does allude to it two or three times in a form quite different from *Srenath*, and speaks of Sen Patrick ‘ as *bishop* in Britain, teacher of Patrick ’ (Armagh) This statement of the scholiast contradicts the late theory.

“ Without repeating any of the proofs elsewhere given in identification of Sen Patrick with Palladius, I would add the following :—It is certain that Palladius was commemorated in Irish calendars. For he came with consecration and fullest jurisdiction from the side of Pope Celestine, as Ireland’s first bishop. The *Book of Armagh* states he was supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom even in Ireland. He was held in such esteem by the Irish as to have been deemed worthy the title of their national apostle—that of Patrick. And when we see the companions of St. Patrick, lay and clerical, of every rank and age, commemorated in Irish calendars, can we suppose for a moment that the heroic Palladius, who came to us from Rome and never returned alive, was forgotten?

“ Yet there appears no commemoration of him in the Martyrologies of Tallaght, of Marian O’Gorman, of Maguire, of Donegal, or of *Ængus*. And this is the more strange, as *Ængus* tells us in his *Epilogue* that he drew on the commemorations of

SS. Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome; on the Martyrology of Eusebius, and 'Ireland's host of books, the calendar of the men of the Gael.' The commemoration, however, of Palladius was as certain as it was natural. It was so natural that calendarists not finding him commemorated under his own, looked out for him under another name. Hence, under the 12th June, in the *Festology* of Ængus, the scholiast finding Torannan commemorated, and understanding it as expressive of a characteristic quality, explains it by Palladius. He was mistaken, for it is a proper name for an abbot in Bangor, commemorated in the Martyrology of Tallaght under the 12th of June. (See Gloss. in L. B., under 12th June.)

"But we need not look for Palladius under a merely characteristic epithet. The *Book of Armagh* assures us that he was called Patrick, and that our national saint was Patrick the Second. On that account we find, in the Canon of Mass in the ancient *Stowe Missal*, a commemoration of two Patricks in succession at the head of the Irish roll of saints. Are we to suppose that one of these referred to a Glastonbury monk, whose existence is mythical, rather than to one whom we know to have been called Patrick?

"Again, when the *Hymn of Piacé*, which all judges pronounce not earlier than the seventh century, states that our national apostle, when dead, went to the other Patrick, we must infer there were only two Patricks known; otherwise the writer would have them distinguished from a third. It is rather remarkable that the Martyrology of Tallaght, in commemorating the two Patricks, calls one of them the Glastonbury one, door-opener, or porter.<sup>1</sup>

"It must be admitted that Palladius, the circumstances of whose death were not known even to a writer in the old *Book of Armagh*, though accurately there detailed by the formal biographer of our national saint, died in Wales, on his return to Rome from Ireland. Possibly his relics were procured for Glastonbury, the great spiritual treasure-house of the British Isles; and a usual way of referring to the presence of relics in a place was by saying that the saint *is* in that place. Palladius, who was called Patrick, was not only bishop, but the leading and first bishop in Ireland. And then the two companions of Palladius returning from

<sup>1</sup> *Ostiarus*. This reminds a person of the *Ostium* mentioned by St. Paul, and of the opening made by Palladius.

Ireland—Augustine and Benedict—and mentioned in the *Book of Armagh*, are easily referable to the two who are mentioned in the Chart of the so-called St. Patrick of Glastonbury as having got a copy of the Chart from him, because they returned with him from Ireland. On this substratum of truth a huge pile of error has been raised. The learned Very Rev. Father A. Barry glances reproachfully at my incredulity; but if he carefully peruse the great work of Benedict XIV.,<sup>1</sup> he shall not admit without question all the visions even of holy monks.

“In conclusion, I may observe that the later Lives of our national saint have been modified in deference to the Glastonbury legends. These lives state that our apostle spent the last thirty years of his life in retirement and contemplation (theoretice); but there are no good grounds for stating—quite the contrary rather—that he ever left Ireland during his long missionary life. He did not spend, either here or in Glastonbury, thirty years in idle meditation, but died here in harness; for the *Book of Armagh* assures us that while on a visit at Saul, County Down, having received heavenly intimation of his approaching death, he proceeded towards Armagh, which he loved so much; but on his way thither he was warned by an angel to return to Saul, adding, ‘There thou shall die, and go the way of thy fathers.’ He returned accordingly, and there died.

“SYLVESTER MALONE.”

## Notices of Books.

THE DONEGAL HIGHLANDS. Recast and Enlarged. Dublin: Sealy, Bryers, and Walker, Middle Abbey-street.

WHETHER historically or physically viewed, Donegal possesses aspects of interest that few other parts of Ireland can justly claim. As the writer of the above excellent guide-book remarks in his Preface, “Wicklow, no doubt, and the Killarney Lakes, furnish softer and more sylvan beauty; but in what is grandest, as well as most exciting in landscape, above all in early remains and memories of by-gone days, Donegal is unsurpassed;

<sup>1</sup> *De Canoniz. et Beatif. SS.*, vol. ii., lib. iii., caput 51, p. 367.]

while its coast offers some of the finest cliff scenery in the world." No Irishman, pretending to any knowledge of the ancient history of his country, can afford to omit from the corner of his library, that he loves and frequents most, the handsome, erudite, Catholic, and patriotic work we are privileged here to introduce to the readers of the *I. E. Record*. Not one of them, even of these in distant lands, we venture to hope, can feel disinclined to add to his store of information about old Tyrconnell, the O'Donnell chieftaincy, the birthplace of St. Columba, Nial Mor, John and Cahir O'Doherty, &c., the home of St. Adamnan, St. Natalis, St. Bethan, St. Congal, St. Myra, St. Asicus, St. Hugh MacBrecan, Marianus Scotus, the Four Masters, Colgan, Ward, &c. Nearly all books, professing to enlighten tourists on the local lore, or ascertained facts about the objects of interest they see, mention the names of mythical or historical celebrities. They stop there, as a rule, stimulating, without gratifying, our desire to be put in constant sight of our own dear "landmark on the cliffs of time," that may serve ever after to identify individual being or thrilling scene, associated with the locality, it may be, of a pleasurable tour.

We can confidently state that quite enough, and nothing more, is presented in the *Desired Highlands* to satisfy any interest and reasonable inquiry. In a popular book, the history of the castles and annals, lies, long in ruins; a brief account of the old lord's seats, and of the battles they were engaged in; of everything strikingly remarkable, even in more modern times; of the chief local and peculiarities of the various places, and of the best means the tourist can resort to for all available conveniences and comforts in travelling and lodging, ought to be hailed as a full and adequate realization of all expectations and wishes.

It is only doing bare justice to the above interesting and attractive work to say, that it is, in our opinion, a model of a tourist's hand-book. Handsomely bound, copiously illustrated, printed in bold pleasing type, it entertains, in well-told narrative, myth, history, and sketch, with marvellous taste, and charming effect. The letterpress extends over 301 pages; the illustrations are numerous and large; and still, the book is quite easily portable.

The luxury of a map in works of this kind is not an altogether new nor unnecessary feature; but such maps usually require strong eyes and delicate hands. Even thus, they soon become a



gradually diminishing collection of unadjustable tatters, mulishly obstinate in their refusal to fraternize amicably with one another. Their only aim, in common, is to sever all attachment and allegiance with the tyrant whose triumph they were originally intended to adorn. In the manual we are reviewing, the map is quite separate and detached from the body of the work, and enjoys an independent, useful, and lasting existence. It reposes in a tastefully prepared pocket at the beginning of the volume, whence it can be taken out, inspected and replaced, without appreciable injury.

In addition to the numerous natural and historical attractions, Donegal holds out to the Irish or foreign tourist, an opportunity of studying the Irish language, where it is spoken with unquestioned purity of sound and form, ought to exercise no small influence on the rapidly growing number of the practical students and admirers of our sweet old tongue.

As the writer, in imitation of the saintly author of the work in its original form, has not allowed his name to appear on the title-page, we are only permitted to say he is a distinguished Donegal man, of great literary attainments, and strong devotion to his religion and country. But he holds out the hand of welcome, and proffers candid advice to all who visit the historic county from which he hails, and to which he has paid such a priceless tribute by his valuable and opportune publication.

“No matter for your foreign name,  
No matter what your sires have done,  
No matter whence or when you came,  
The land shall claim you as a son !”

Two other very eminent Donegal scholars, both long since gone to reap the fruits of their exemplary lives—the Right Rev. Monsignor Stephens, and Mr. Thomas C. MacGinley—have left us most readable and useful guide-books to the coast scenery and interesting old ruins, scattered broadly over the ancient territory of the O'Donnells.

E. M.

# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

DECEMBER, 1893.

---

## ST. GALL, APOSTLE OF ALLEMANIA.

ONE of the most remarkable figures amongst all the early missionaries that Ireland sent to preach the Gospel in foreign lands was undoubtedly St. Gall. The extraordinary influence which he exercised in the region in which he laboured is attested by many striking and unusual facts. Around the spot, in a gorge of the Rhetian Alps in which he definitely fixed his abode, a large and thriving city has grown that still bears his name. A historic canton of the Swiss confederation also perpetuates his memory. A vast number of churches, convents, schools and colleges, acknowledge him as their patron. The library of the famous monastery that arose over his grave still draws learned investigators from distant countries, as it drew Poggio Bracciolini at the time of the renaissance, and Niebuhr at the commencement of the present century, in search of manuscripts and books. The Catholic faith which he planted in these wild valleys and on these rugged hill-sides is still verdant and young, in spite of the centuries that have elapsed since his death. And it may be added, without any fear of exaggeration, that there is no other region that owed the conversion of its inhabitants to the zeal of Irish missionaries that so thoroughly and so gratefully recognises its indebtedness. The late illustrious Bishop of St. Gall, Dr. Carl Greith, one of the most learned and devoted men of his time, bore eloquent testimony to the debt which his country owed,

after God, to Ireland for the divine gift of faith. In his work on the old Irish Church and its connection with Rome, *Gall and Allemania*,<sup>1</sup> which he dedicated to his cathedral chapter, and to the clergy of his diocese, he writes :—

“Saintly and learned men of a far-distant past will speak to you in these pages, and tell you what the ancient church of Ireland once accomplished in the Gallic empire of the Franks, and in our own Allemanian fatherland. The acts and words of irrefutable testimony, which you can examine for yourselves, will form so many links in the golden chain of a magnificent historic demonstration as to the antiquity, the truth, the unchangeable character of our holy religion. Deep in the recesses of early Christian times we shall find the roots of that noble tree, which St. Gall once planted in this land, and which has supplied to our people for so many centuries the fruits of heavenly grace and of eternal life. It will be made evident by the clearest proofs that the Church of St. Gall is a branch of the Irish Church of St. Patrick, and that she, in turn, is a daughter of the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all the Churches in the world, and that accordingly our Church has been from its earliest origin at one in faith with the oldest Churches and with the Holy See of Rome.”

Over a thousand years before words of analogous import were addressed by Ermenrich of Reichenau<sup>2</sup> to Grimald, Abbot of St. Gall. Walafrid Strabo<sup>3</sup> and Notker Balbulus, vied with one another in expressions of similar recognition; whilst in modern times another bishop and famous historian, Dr. Hefele, of Rothenburg, proclaims the gratitude of his native Wurtemberg. In a valuable historical work, in which he speaks of the influence of St. Columbanus and St. Gall, he writes<sup>4</sup>:—“The greater part of Southern Germany and of the North of Switzerland, still keeps

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Altirischen Kirche und ihrer Verbindung Mit. Rom. Gallien und Allemanien*, von Carl. Johann Greith, Bischof von St. Gallen.

<sup>2</sup> Wie Könnten wir die Insel Irland, jemals vergessen von wo der Strahlen glanz eines so grossen liches und die Sonne des Glaubens für uns aufgegangen sind. Quoted by Greith, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> “*Hibernia insula de qua nobis tantum decus emicuit.*” See Mabillon, vol. 217.

<sup>4</sup> “Heilige und dankbare Erinnerungen knüpft noch heute ein grosser theil des südlichen Deutschlands und der nordöstlichen Schweiz an diese beiden, grossen missionare aus Erin,” *Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums im Südwestlichen Deutschland*, page 261.

in holy and immortal memory the names of these two great missionaries from Erin."

There is, we believe, no record whatever of the life of St. Gall in any of the extant chronicles or books of our ancient Irish monasteries. Fortunately his achievements were of such account that he found several biographers in the country of his adoption at a comparatively early period. The most famous of these was Walafried Strabo, who had studied classics at the School of St. Gall, and philosophy and Scripture under Rabban Maur, at Fulda, and who afterwards became Abbot of the Monastery of Reichenau, or "Augia Dives," in the lake of Constance.<sup>1</sup> Walafried was well known for his accomplishments and learning, particularly for his cultivated literary style, and was asked by his friend Gosbert, Abbot of St. Gall, about the year 833, to write the lives of the father and founder of the monastery and of his first successor St. Othmar. He was fortunately prevailed on to accept the task. To facilitate his work, an old biography, written in rather rude latinity, possibly by the monk Wittin, whose famous vision the same Walafried has immortalized,<sup>2</sup> was placed in his hands. The result is an excellent biography, as far as the part of the saint's life that was spent on the continent is concerned. No doubt faults have been found in it, and some slight inaccuracies and contradictions have been pointed out by the veteran critic, Dr. Meyer von Knonau, of Zurich University;<sup>3</sup> but, on the whole, it is admitted on all hands as a substantially accurate account of the saint's missionary life. With regard to his youth and pre-missionary career, St. Gall, on the other hand, shares the oblivion in which the early lives of so many other Irish missionaries of the same period are involved. All we know of him is, that he was born somewhere about the year 550; that he belonged to a family of considerable rank; that his parents were "secundum Deum religiosi et secundum seculum nobiles;"<sup>4</sup> and that they

<sup>1</sup> *Palladius*, Oct. 16th, part 55, pp. 859, 860.

<sup>2</sup> See Goldst., *Revue Albano-romaine des Scriptores*, tom i., page 218.

<sup>3</sup> *Mittheilungen zur Vaterländischen Geschichte. St. Gall'sche Geschichtsquellen*, neu herausgegeben durch Gerold Meyer von Knonau.



onfided him for his education while he was still a boy to the care of Columbanus, who was then teaching in the monastery of Bangor, which St. Comgall had founded a few years previously.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the part of the country to which he belonged, and to the Irish traditions regarding his origin, Dr. Greith<sup>2</sup> makes the following statement:—

“An Irish monk of the ninth century informed his brethren in Switzerland, that King Unuchun, of Ireland, had a son named Kethernach, who was an excellent Christian, and that *he* was the father of Gallehc, whose name was latinized into Gallus. Ildefonsus von Arx, the historian of our canton, expresses doubt as to this origin, though on what grounds we know not: for, after the Hebrews, no people in the world preserved the genealogies of their families so well as the Irish: and we know that kings were numerous in that country, as attested by Reeves.<sup>3</sup> We think it probable, therefore, that Gall was in reality the son of Kethernach, whose father was one of the most distinguished heroes of the Red Branch Knights, and whose castle, ‘Munitio Cethirni,’ now Mountsandel, in North Londonderry, was close to the place at the seaside where Columkille and St. Comgall retired for rest after the convention of Drunceath, and where they probably made the acquaintance of the prince who afterwards sent his son to the school of St. Comgall, at Bangor.”

All St. Gall's biographers lay stress on the liberal education which he received at Bangor, and which indeed is regarded as almost wonderful for the time. He could not have had a better master than Columbanus, under whom, we are told, he very quickly mastered the rules of grammar,<sup>4</sup> rhetoric, and geometry, and became skilled in the subtle art of metre. Soon also he became thoroughly versed in

<sup>1</sup> “Fuit viro nobilitate pollens magisque bono conversatione fulgens quem reverentia paternalis nobis tradidit Gallum nuncupare. Ille primævum florem in insula Hybernia ducens, cum ab ipsa pueritia sua Deo adhaesisset, studiisque liberalium artium mancipasset parentum nutu commendabatur viro venerabili Columbano; qui vitæ normam exemplis patrum tenens, vestigiumque humilitatis cunctis prætendens meliitluans doctrinam secum degentibus opportune tradidit.” (*Vita Antiqua.*)

<sup>2</sup> *Altirische Kirche*, pages 244, 245.

<sup>3</sup> Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, page 68.

<sup>4</sup> “Superna gratia se praeveniente tanto studio divinas epotavit Scripturas ut de thesauro suo nova proferre potuit et vetera: grammaticæ etiam regulas metrorumque subtilitates capaci consequeretur ingenio.”

Scripture and theology, and before his departure from Bangor it is pretty certain that he was ordained a priest.

As the sixth century was drawing to a close, the fire of divine love burned with particular lustre in the breast of the great Columbanus, and urged him, like the patriarch of old, to go forth from his own land and from amongst his own people, and to come into a region where all the strength and energy of his character should be required. It was customary for the leader of a missionary expedition in those days to take with him, if possible, twelve companions, and when time had matured the project of Columbanus, Gallehc or Gall, whom he himself had educated and trained, was the first to be invited to join the enterprise. The company was quickly formed, and in due time set sail from Belfast Lough. From their departure from Ireland until the eventful day when they separated at Bregentz, the history of one of these great companions may be said to be also the history of the other, so closely were they associated in storm and sunshine, in good and evil fortune. The early part of St. Gall's missionary life is, therefore, more appropriately narrated in conjunction with that of Columbanus. Here we take it up at the parting of the ways; *i.e.*, when Columbanus, fearing the inveterate and unscrupulous hatred of Brunchilde after the victory of her favourite grandson, Theoderic of Burgundy, started for Italy, taking all his companions with him except Gall, who was overcome by fatigue and illness and was unable for the journey. Columbanus was disappointed and somewhat dissatisfied at Gall's evident inclination to remain behind him, and thought that possibly the illness was not as serious as his companion imagined. Strict disciplinarian as he was, he therefore, ordered Gall to refrain from saying Mass as long as he (Columbanus) should live, an order which Gall faithfully observed in virtue of the obedience which he owed to his master and superior in religious life.<sup>1</sup> When now left to himself, Gall passed over the lake to Arbona, where he was once again hospitably received by the priest Willimar, who

<sup>1</sup> "Si laborum meorum particeps fieri non vis, diebus meis missam non celebrabis."

had formerly sheltered himself and Columbanus, and who now gave him two deacons, Magnoald and Theodore, to attend him during his illness and supply all his wants. During the time of his convalescence he was one day speaking to Hiltibode, another deacon and companion of Willimar, who was a native of the country and knew all its surroundings well. Gall inquired from him whether there was any place, in the forest close by, suitable for the cell of one who wished to retire altogether from the world. "For I desire," he said, "with a great desire to spend my days in solitude according to the words of the Psalmist:<sup>1</sup> 'Lo! I have gone far off, and I abode in the wilderness, and waited for Him that has power to save me.'" The deacon replied that the forest there was rugged and damp, that its high mountains and narrow glens were frequented by wild beasts—bears and wolves and fierce wild boars. But the saint did not fear these animals. "If God be for us, who is against us?" he replied. "He who rescued Daniel from the lion's den will know how to protect me." On the following day, therefore, they penetrated far into the depths of the forest, and when they came to a slope on the banks of the Steinach the aged missionary tripped and fell; and taking this as an expression of the divine will, he was heard by Hiltibode, who ran to his assistance, to exclaim, "This is my resting-place for evermore." He calmly arose, and took a branch from a hazel-bush that was near him, and making it into the shape of a cross attached to it some relics which he carried with him, and fixed it in the ground, uttering at the same time the prayer: "O Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of the world,<sup>2</sup> who camest to the aid of the human race by the triumph of Thy cross, in honour of Thy elect make this place habitable for Thy glory." Hiltibode proceeded to make a fire of brambles, and caught some fish in the stream, and whilst the companions were resting, after a slight

<sup>1</sup> "Desiderio desideravit anima mea permanere diebus meis in solitudine admonente nos Palmista ac dicente. 'Ecce elongavi fugiens et mansi in solitudine et expectabam eum qui me salvum faceret.'" Psalm liv. 8, 9.

<sup>2</sup> "Domine, Jesu Christe, Creator Mundi, qui crucis trophæo subvenisti humano generi, da in honore electorum tuorum locum istum ad laudem tuam habitabilem."

refection, a bear came forth from the thickets, and taking in his mouth a large branch of wood approached the place in which the strangers lay. Gall calmly ordered the wild beast, in the name of Christ, his Master, to carry the branch and cast it into the fire, which he immediately did. He then gave the animal some bread to eat, and commanded him to retire to the mountains and roam at freedom there, but to return no more to the valleys, and to injure neither cattle nor men. To the great relief and astonishment of Hiltibode, the bear departed as he had been told.

This story or legend of St. Gall and the bear has inspired many a work of art in poetry and sculpture, in painting and engraving, in heraldry and stained glass. It is to be seen in the frescoes of Morato at St. Gall itself, in the windows of the Cathedral of Constance, in the oak choirs of some of the oldest churches in Switzerland. It was wrought in exquisite ivory in a "bas-relief" on the cover of the "*Evangelium Longum*," in the ninth century, by the famous artist and monk Tutilo of St. Gall. It is represented in the poems of Ratpert and Ekkehart, and in the arms of the Cantons of Appenzell, and St. Gall. It has about it all the traces of antiquity and authenticity which can be obtained from such ancient testimony. And, as Bishop Greith observes in relating the incident, when the man and the circumstances are taken into account, it need not give rise to the least incredulity. Power over nature was a privilege which Almighty God usually bestowed on his friends under the old dispensation. Should we imagine that it was to disappear under the new?

St. Gall was soon joined in his retreat by the two deacons, Magnold and Theodore, already mentioned, and by several other ecclesiastics, amongst whom one in particular, John of Sennwald, became the man after the father's heart, a model of learning and at the same time of austere virtue. Once definitely settled down in the desert, St. Gall is said to have left it only on three occasions. The first was when he was entreated by Gunzo, a Duke on the Allemanian side of the Rhine, to visit his daughter Fridiburga, who was afflicted with obsession, and was



tortured without any respite by the demon. It required much persuasion to bring the hermit from his retirement, but at length he was prevailed upon to go to the Duke's castle, where he delivered the suffering princess from her tortures. On his departure he strongly advised her to consecrate altogether to Christ the body that had been purified, notwithstanding the fact that she had been for a considerable time betrothed to Sigibert, the young King of Austrasia. With the consent of Sigibert, Fridiburga retired for a while to a convent at Metz to return thanks to God for the grace which she had received. From there she sent word to her betrothed of her desire to be freed from her obligations in order that she might consecrate herself altogether to religious life. The king immediately repaired to Metz, and ordered Fridiburga to put on her bridal ornaments, promising her at the same time that all her wishes should be satisfied. When everything was ready he took her by the right hand, and led her to the altar, where he said, "As thou wast prepared for me with thy ornaments, so do I give thee as a spouse to my Lord Jesus Christ;"<sup>1</sup> after which he left the church, and was seen to weep bitterly outside. Having learned how Fridiburga was restored to health, Sigibert sent word to Gunzo to have every honour paid to St. Gall, and that he should have, if he required it, lands and assistance to establish a monastery.

The second time that Gall went out into the world was on the occasion of the election and consecration of a bishop at Constance. This election was attended by a great concourse of clergy and people, according to the custom of the times, and Gall having been specially invited to be present by the Duke Gunzo did not feel himself at liberty to decline. He accordingly proceeded to Constance, taking with him the two deacons, John and Magnoald, little expecting the events that were in preparation there.

The proceedings were very solemn and impressive. The Bishops of Augsburg and Spiers had come to consecrate whoever should be selected. By a privilege sometimes

<sup>1</sup> "Sicut mihi fuisti præparata cum ornamentis, sic te dabo ad sponsam Domino meo Jesu Christo."

granted in these times, the Duke Gunzo presided at the deliberations. He put the question as to whom they wished to have as their pontiff. They replied unanimously that there was amongst them a man named Gall who had good repute throughout the whole region,<sup>1</sup> who was profoundly versed in the Scriptures; who was, moreover, full of wisdom, just, chaste, humble and mild, generous to the poor, a father to the orphan and a friend to the distressed, and that they greatly desired to have him as their pontiff. The Duke then inquired what Gall thought of the proposal. But the saint replied that those who desired to confer this honour upon him were not perhaps aware that the Canons of the Church forbade the appointment of strangers where natives were available. As to him he was only a poor pilgrim who scattered the seeds of Divine faith on his path; but that he had with him a deacon named John, who was well known to him, who was a native of that region, and who would worthily fill the vacant see. When John heard his name mentioned for such an exalted position, he fled from the assembly, and took refuge in the church of St. Stephen, outside the city. Nevertheless, St. Gall stood sponsor for him in his absence. He said that he knew him well; that he was learned, prudent, mild, and just. This was sufficient. John, on the apostle's sole recommendation, was selected as bishop, and had to submit at once to be ordained and consecrated.

At the ceremony of consecration St. Gall was asked to address the people who had come from all the country around to witness the proceedings. The sermon<sup>2</sup> which he preached on the occasion has been substantially preserved, and is a magnificent review of the dealings of God with men since the creation of the world. It reveals a profound knowledge of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, and an intimate acquaintance with the

<sup>1</sup> "Quia iste Gallus vir Dei est, habens famam bonam per universam regionem, instructus de Scripturis ac plenus sapientia, justus et castus corpore, mansuetus et humilis, largitor elemosinarum, pater orphanorum et viduarum. Talem decet habere pontificatum."

<sup>2</sup>The Latin version of the sermon is to be found amongst the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Canisius.

explanation of difficult passages given by the fathers of the Church.

Bishop Greith<sup>1</sup> inquires how it was that the ordination and consecration of John could take place so quickly after his selection. The answer is, that where the conditions of the time or the locality required it, Popes and councils granted exceptional jurisdiction to bishops in this particular respect. Paulinus of Nola, a nobleman, Roman senator, poet, and consul, was ordained a priest at Barcelona in 393 by Bishop Lampadius, a short time after his baptism, and received all the inferior orders on the same day as the priesthood, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Council of Sardica, held in 348. Pope Zozimus, in 418, in his instructions to the Bishops of Gaul, Spain, and Africa; and Celestine, in 428, writing to the Bishops of France, also insist upon the observance of the interstices. They were nevertheless dispensed with when the occasion required. St. Ambrose was consecrated Bishop of Milan within eight days after his baptism. And where the Church was not fully organized, as in infidel or even half converted countries, the most extensive faculties were given to bishops who evangelized them or lived on their confines. For instance, St. Augustine, in England, received powers from Pope Gregory not only to appoint bishops to new sees and districts, but to appoint his own successor. Pope Sergius gave authority to the Archbishop of Hamburgh not only over the Hanseatic towns, but also over Denmark and Scandania.<sup>2</sup> Similar privileges were enjoyed at an earlier period by the Archbishops of Tours, Arles, Narbonne, Paris, Limoges. Their acts were as valid as if done by the Pope himself. It is but natural, therefore, that the bishop who consecrated John should have had jurisdiction either directly or through delegation from the Pope.

For some days subsequent to the proceedings described above, Gall remained at Constance with his distinguished disciple, and then returned once more to his solitude. Not long after his return he was made aware in a vision of the

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Altirischen Kirche*, page 382.

<sup>2</sup> See Malone on *St. Patrick*, pp. 156-158.

death of his friend and master, Columbanus, and caused no little surprise to his clerics when he proceeded to celebrate Mass for the eternal repose of his former superior. They were possibly unaware of the injunction which Columbanus had laid upon him at the time of their separation, and were unaccustomed to see their master offer the Holy Sacrifice.

As Gall was anxious to learn all about the last days of Columbanus, and his final dispositions in reference to himself, he despatched Magnoald to Bobbio to find out all that had happened there. Magnoald reached Bobbio with difficulty, having had no idea previously of the situation of the monastery. He was received, however, by the monks there with the greatest kindness. He learned that Columbanus had directed before his death<sup>1</sup> that his abbot's staff should be sent to his disciple Gall, as a pledge of friendship and forgiveness. They also wrote a full account of the progress of their monastery; and confiding both letter and staff to the messenger, Magnoald set out on his return journey without delay.

Not long after Magnoald's return a deputation of six Irish monks<sup>2</sup> came from Luxeuil to invite St. Gall to become their abbot, after the death of Eustasius, one of the founder's most faithful disciples, who was appointed under the protection of Clothaire to direct the old foundation in Burgundy. But Gall could not be induced to leave his solitude. He dismissed his countrymen with the friendliest assurances of his interest in their welfare, but expressed at the same time the strongest desire to end his days in peace and retirement.

Only on one occasion more would he consent to absent himself from his home even for a few days. It was when his old friend, Willimar of Arbona, came to visit him, and entreated of him to come to the celebration of some festival

<sup>1</sup> "Praeceptor noster jussit nobis, adhuc vivens, ut per istum baculum Gallus absolveretur."

<sup>2</sup> "Post haec autem contingit quod vir Dei Eustasius hoc acrumnosum exilium dereliquit qui venerabili Columbanus in regimine Luxoviensis coenobii successit. Sed fraternalis societas, prioris conversationis non immemor, ob adquirendum magisterium electi Dei Galli tractabat atque consono consilio sex fratres ex Hibernensibus comitibus ejus, cum epistola electionem nuntiante ad eum dirigebant."



in his church. Gratitude for past favours prevailed over his love of solitude. "*Caritas non quaerit quae sua sunt*," he said; and he went down to Arbona, where he remained two days "*in opere Dei*," "detained<sup>1</sup> by the people as well as by the priest." But the apostle was now far advanced in years, and when he was about to set out on the third day fever had seized him, and obliged him to stay. For fifteen days the soul lingered in a body worn to extenuation by the labours and cares of a long and ardent life. The crown was now ready for such unwearied services. Great in death as in life was the venerable apostle, and the days of his last illness were as fruitful in examples of perfection as the best lessons of his life. On the 16th October, 627, he breathed his last; and to this day, "on the anniversary of that date," writes Bishop Greith, "the hills and valleys, the trees of the forest, and the cascades of our native mountains, re-echo the praises of that humble monk, and literally verify the descriptive words composed for the occasion by Rapertus of St. Gall over one thousand years ago":—

"Jam fidelis turba fratrum voce dulci sonet :

Hymnum dicat et serena partiatur dragmata ;

Dulce pondus et beatum in lectica deferens :

Scandens et descendens inter montium confinia ;

Sylvarum scrutando loca vallumque concava

Nullus expers ut locus sit istius solaminis.

Jamque coelum, jamque terra, jamque pontus laudibus

Plaudat atque circumquaque vox emissa plebibus

Auctorem, patremque tanti tamque clari luminis.

Hinc exultent astra coeli, lacteusque circulus

Signa tum bisseña saltent et corona nobilis

Ornatusque totus soli conditori cognitus."

There is a considerable difference of opinion amongst historians as to the exact date of St. Gall's death. Lanigan,<sup>2</sup> for instance, fixes it at 645; Ussher at 625; Ware, 635; Reeves, 646;<sup>3</sup> Mabillon, 646; Montalembert, 646; Greith,<sup>4</sup> 640; Hefele,<sup>5</sup> 627; Neugart, Eckhart and Pagi, quoted by

<sup>1</sup> "Vi coactus sacerdote necnon et a populo."

<sup>2</sup> *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii., page 438.

<sup>3</sup> Adaman's *Columba*, page 34.

<sup>4</sup> *Altirische Kirche*, page 640.

<sup>5</sup> *Einführung des Christenthums*, page 304.

Hefele, in the same year; Dr. Frederick,<sup>1</sup> of Munich University (the old Catholic historian), also supports 627; whereas Hauck,<sup>2</sup> a painstaking Protestant writer, goes in for 645; and Rettberg, another Protestant, for 650. Meyer von Knonau, who spends himself on insignificant details of criticism, has no light whatever to throw on this question from an archaeological point of view. He confines himself to enumerating rather confusedly the opinions of others.<sup>3</sup>

The difference arises on account of the assertion of the saint's oldest biographers, that he lived to the age of ninety-five years. On the other hand, we know that the school of Bangor, in which he was educated as a boy, was not founded<sup>4</sup> till the year 558 or 559. The earliest year in which he could have entered Bangor was 560 or 562; and if he lived to the age of ninety-five years, he must have died about 645. However, the chronology of the diocese of Constance, the succession of the French kings, and the events of Bobbio and Luxeuil would seem to contradict altogether the possibility of the saint's having reached to such a great age. For instance, the chronology of the diocese of Constance fixes the death of the Bishop,<sup>5</sup> Johannes, who was Gall's great friend, at 630, and we know that he attended the saint's obsequies. The death of Eustasius of Luxeuil took place about 625, and Walafried distinctly states that Gall did not survive him long. It is probable, therefore, that he died about 627, at the ripe age of seventy-seven years, a good span for one who had laboured as he did. To make him ninety-five years at the time of his death, would be to make him older than Columbanus, his master, which in this case would be absurd. As the writer in the *Acta Sanctorum* says, anyone acquainted with these ancient *codices* know how little reliance can be placed on figures

<sup>1</sup> *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. ii., page 560.

<sup>2</sup> *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, *Erster Theil*, page 508.

<sup>3</sup> *Mittheilungen zur lateinischen Geschichte*, Neue Folge 2. Heft, page 14.

<sup>4</sup> See *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*, by the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, page 367.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Frederick. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, pages 560-563.

that do not form an essential part of the object aimed at by the writer.<sup>1</sup>

The regard of the people of Rhaetia and of Southern Allemania for the apostle of their country has never changed. It is alive and strong to day as it was on the day when a great concourse of people, headed by the Bishop of Constance, followed his remains, in weeping and lamentation, from the town of Arbona, at the water's edge, to the saint's last resting-place in the mountains. But never were their sentiments so beautifully and so harmoniously expressed as in the ninth century, when the monastery was in its bloom. Then it was that Hartmann, the learned monk, addresses Notker, the saint and chronicler and poet, and asks him to repeat in verse the last words of the founder :—

“ Posco, magister !  
Inclyte Notker !  
Ultima Galli  
Verba renarra !”

And Notker goes even beyond his expectations, and begins at the beginning :—

“ Cumque pro Christo, patriam, parentes  
Rura, cognatos, genus et caducam  
Gloriam mundi simul abdicare  
Tergere certant.”

Another poet, Ratpert, is asked to compose some verses for the festival of the saint, and he writes :—

“ Annua, Sancte Dei, celebremus festa diei  
Qua pater e terris sidera, Galle, petis.  
Ecce dies populis micat haec sanctissima nostris  
Quorum tu princeps auctor ad astra meas.  
Finibus occiduis abiens succedis Eois,  
Dans lucem plebis dogmatis igne tui ;  
Quae tenebrosa fuit fidei nec luce refulsit  
Per te coelestem coepit habere diem.”

Nor was this devotion to St. Gall confined only to the

<sup>1</sup> “ Notum est omnibus qui antiquos codices tractarunt, quam caducum sit testimonium quod notis arithmeticis presertim Romanis nititur, quando aliunde facta historica constringunt.” Oct. 16, page 881.

region that was once the scene of his labours. As Bishop Greith reminds us <sup>1</sup>:—

“It soon made its way over the Alps and into the heart of Italy. At an early period a church was dedicated to St. Gall at Florence. He was honoured on the banks of the Trebbia, in the monasteries of Etruria, near old Aquileia, in Styria, where the Abbey of Mosaccio was founded in his honour in the year 1030. Throughout the whole of central Europe, Switzerland, Germany, Bohemia, Austria, the Tyrol, his festival is celebrated in every diocese by a special office, and he is justly regarded, according to the words of Notker, as the apostle of Allemania, which he found plunged in heathenism, the abode of serpents, wild beasts and demons, but which he rescued from the darkness of ignorance and enlightened with the light of the Sun of Justice, who is Christ Himself.”<sup>2</sup>

The literary, artistic, and scientific spirit that was cultivated with such glory in after years at the monastery of St. Gall, as we shall subsequently see, is the best indication as to the nature of the impulse which it received from its founder. Not less positive and fruitful was the example of missionary zeal which he set to those who grew up around him. Magnoald, whose name we have mentioned already, became animated with the same bold spirit as his master, and penetrated into the Bavarian highlands, where he founded, at the mouth or jaws of the famous pass of the Julian Alps, *Ad Fauces Julius*, the monastery of Füssen, which became, like St. Gall itself, a centre of civilization and progress in these barbarous times. Theodore, the other deacon mentioned as having gone to join St. Gall, from Arbona, established farther north the monastery of Kempten, which, at one period of the Middle Ages, owned the territory around it for sixteen square miles. Both of these monks are set down by some continental writers<sup>3</sup> as Irishmen. It is generally admitted that they did not belong to this country,<sup>4</sup> but they were

<sup>1</sup> *Altirische Kirche*, page 101.

<sup>2</sup> “Divina pietas bestum Gallum gentis alemanicę apostolum fecit, qui nationem quam paganismo involutam reperit, fidei veritate imbutam de tenebris ignorantie ad solem justitię qui Christus est, ipse callis Dei solers viator reduxit.”

<sup>3</sup> See *Bavaria Sancta*, vol. iv., page 176.

<sup>4</sup> “The first writer who designated Magnus an *Irishman*, “ex præfata patria Hibernia procreatus,” was a German monk of the ninth century, named Arnemarich of Ellwangen, who assumed the name of Theodore, and



both associated in the most intimate way with St. Gall. He it was who formed and trained them, according to the words of the panegyrist of Magnoaldus :—

“Auctus a Gallo superis amando  
Dogmate largo.”

Walafried Strabo enumerates over eighty extraordinary miracles which took place at the grave of St. Gall, with all the substantial testimony of authentic records to bear them witness ; but, he adds,<sup>1</sup> that the number he has left unrelated is far greater still, and that he refrains from mentioning these chiefly out of regard for the patience of the fastidious reader.

The Catholic faith has always flourished in the land of St. Gall ; and though a rough breach was made in its battlements at the time of the Reformation, it still holds its own, and even gains ground as time goes on. One of the features of its ecclesiastical life which has most interest for us is the affection it has always maintained for the venerable Mother Church of Ireland, through which it first received the faith. We have already mentioned more than once the name of the illustrious Dr. Greith. The recommendation which he gives his clergy, in dedicating his book to them, reveals the warm affection for Ireland, which he tells us he inherited from his predecessors, and from the ancient traditions of his Church.

“But whilst [he writes] the Churches of St. Gall and of Ireland have been thus closely bound together, and have to this day kept their ancient faith unchanged, may our people take example by the time-honoured fidelity and steadfastness of the Catholics of Ireland who support with such splendid generosity from their poor resources churches, clergy, and schools. Marked

wanted to pass himself off as the companion of St. Magnus. There is ample internal evidence, however, that his work is a forgery. What object he could have had in making St. Magnus an Irishman, except there was some tradition or belief to that effect, we cannot say ; but, as Greith very clearly shows (page 255), no reliance whatever can be placed on his authority. Of course it is not impossible that they should have been Irishmen, but they are first mentioned as being in the company of Willimar at Arbona. That is the chief ground for saying they were natives.

<sup>1</sup> “Ceterum tot et tantà sunt ejusdem sancti patris miracula ut nec a studiosis scriptoribus propter copiam possint comprehendi nec a fastidiosis lectoribus sine taedio percurri.”

from the first with the seal of the authority of the Vicar of Christ on earth, and having her foundations fixed on the rock of Peter, the Irish Church was so zealous in promoting the interests of Christianity, that in early times she earned amongst the nations the honourable name of 'The Island of Saints and Doctors,' and when persecution came upon her the equally glorious title of 'The Martyred Nation of the West.' Under the ægis of the cruelest despots the furies of prejudice and hatred were let loose on the Catholics of Ireland for seven centuries: their properties were confiscated, their churches robbed, their monasteries plundered, the schools which they loved were closed, and ignorance brutally forced upon them. Their creed was made a crime. But in exile, in prison, or on the scaffold, their attitude was the same. No power on earth could rob them of the Catholic faith. The highest of earthly premiums was placed upon apostacy, but to no purpose. They lost everything, wealth, power, education, industry, but the faith of their fathers they did not lose. To that the Irish nation clung in the depths of her desolation: to that she is faithful when the pall of sorrow hangs around her, and the words of the poet are verified:—

'The kings are dead that raised their swords  
In Erin's right of old;  
The bards that dashed from fearless chords  
Her name and praise lie cold.  
But fixed as fate, her altars stand;  
Unchanged, like God, her faith;  
Her Church still holds in equal hand  
The keys of life and death.'<sup>1</sup>

"And now as soon as the sun of liberty shines upon her again, the old missionary spirit appears once more, and has laid on the continent of America the foundations of another triumph, perhaps greater than any of those<sup>2</sup> that have gone before."

Let us hope that his forecast may be true, not only of America, but of many another country besides.

J. F. HOGAN.

<sup>1</sup> *Innisfail*, by Aubrey de Vere, Part iii.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte des Altirischen Kirche*, pp. vii., viii.

## THE MASS OF THE APOSTLES.—II.

WE turn to those early liturgies in the same spirit and with the same intent that we would, if the chance were offered to us, turn to a Christian of those early days, and ask—What was taught, and what was believed, regarding the divine mystery of the altar in those far-away times? speak, and tell us.

It were not, indeed, possible for our times to bring from the grave, as happened to the martyred Bishop of Poland, St. Stanislaus, a witness who would testify to us of the belief and worship of those young ages of faith. But, instead, we fall back upon the records of those days; and they, in a sense, are more satisfactory; inasmuch as the testimony of one person would, or may, speak only for the individual, whereas the liturgies speak for both degrees, priests and people, for all tribes and tongues, and for generations and generations of believers.

In a bold and striking passage, the learned Jesuit writer, Franzelin, appeals to those early records, and is all but satisfied to entrust the whole case to their testimony. He says:—

“If the words of Christ the Lord have been, all along from Apostolic times understood by the whole Christian name, in their obvious sense; and if it has therefore been believed by all Christians that in the Eucharist are contained really and truly the Body and Blood of Christ; and if, moreover, from all the intrinsic rules of interpretation, the obvious sense can be demonstrated genuine, and the metaphorical absurd, surely, we are to conclude for the obvious sense of the words of Christ; nay, antecedently and directly, from the axioms of philosophy, the possibility is defined of the thing enunciated in that sense; or, at least, that its repugnance is not evident. But that constancy and universality of the Catholic interpretation, and the intrinsic rules of criticism demonstrating the truth of the proper sense, are absolutely so . . . therefore there is unquestioned certainty of the true sense of the words of Christ.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *De Eucharistia*, page 7.

And, again in his eighth *Thesis* he writes:—

“To the obvious sense of the testamentary words of Christ, the faith everywhere and at all times prevailing, among all the Churches of the New Testament, in the true and real Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord, fittingly responds; and although the testimony of this universal belief be contained in the common profession of all the faithful, that the very Body of the Lord is truly in the Eucharist, is there to be worshipped, and to be received; yet, the belief is specially demonstrated from those documents in which the Fathers and the definite works of the whole Church have declared this matter dogmatically.”

And, proceeding to prove this *Thesis*, he goes on to say:—

“From the express testimony of all the Fathers of all ages and of all lands, and from all the liturgies, eastern as well as western, this profession of faith on the part of the pastors, as well as on the part of the people, is put beyond doubt: to wit, *that which is offered, that which is eaten and drunk in the Eucharist, is the Body and Blood of the Lord.*”<sup>1</sup>

In almost identical words, the Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—

“These passages of Scripture regarding the divine institution are everywhere to be expounded by the pastor, and he will emphatically press upon the attention of the faithful that their meaning, in itself obvious, is placed beyond all doubt by the uniform interpretation and authority of the Holy Catholic Church.”

The argument had been already most clearly stated by the fathers of the Council of Trent, sess. xiii., chap. iv.:—

“And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own Body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy synod now declares it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.”

So self-evident, and so consonant to reason is this appealing to the early liturgies, that we find non-Catholic writers making use of it. Thus in Hutton's *Life of Cardinal*

<sup>1</sup> Page 222.



Newman we read that, not alone at the time when the great English thinker was approaching the Church, but long before any idea of becoming a Catholic came into his head, this doctrine of appealing to the early liturgies was held by him; and, furthermore, had been taught him by men who yet all their lives remained Protestant. Thus:—

“ Dr. Hawkins also taught Newman the doctrine of tradition; namely, that the tradition of the Church was the original authority for doctrinal statements, and that Scripture was never intended to supply the first converts with their doctrinal creed, but only to afford the verification of that creed with which the tradition of the Church had furnished them. . . . Thus Newman early came to assume that the living Church was the body to which we must still cling, both for the explicit statement of our creed and for the explicit exposition of rites and their significance; while he regarded Scripture only as containing that body of facts to which the Church referred as her authority for the creed which she inculcated and the worship she enjoined.”<sup>1</sup>

The treatment of her first converts by the early Church is a matter closely connected with these liturgies, and the knowledge of which is very useful in understanding them properly. Surrounded as we are to-day with a set of circumstances differing *toto cælo* from those which surrounded the early Church, our manner of treating converts differs (it might almost be said) *toto cælo* from hers. We have Christians of some belief or other around us—at least we have persons acknowledging the existence of one Supreme Being, who are seeking admission. We start with the mysteries of faith, the doctrines contained in the Creed, and finally the discipline and customs of the Catholic Church. Converts with us are kept in some course of probation only for a few months; a year would be looked upon as long. All the time they are not alone allowed to attend, but are expected and invited to attend the solemn Mysteries of the Altar, and *a fortiore* the lesser ceremonies of the administration of the sacraments, preaching, catechizing, and so on. Now, how entirely different it was from this in the early ages, ecclesiastical history teaches us.

There are three main points, which have to be especially considered in the matter of the Church's relations with the early converts—preaching, teaching, and offering the Holy Sacrifice. The preaching was for the most part done in the Jewish synagogues. The Jewish religion was the nearest to the Christian religion. The Jews themselves were accustomed to make converts (*proselytæ*) to their own religion wherever their synagogues had been established; and they were established (as we see from the Acts of the Apostles) in almost every city of the Grecian and Roman world. They were, therefore, accustomed to disputation and conversion: but unfortunately the bulk of them at the beginning of Christianity wished for no disputation but the disputation that favoured their own views, and no conversions but the conversions to Judaism. We see, from the case of Cornelias, what objection even the great Prince of the Apostles had to speak to those outside the synagogue about even the great mystery of salvation. Preaching then in the very early times took place in the Temple at Jerusalem and the Jewish synagogues all over the land, and was offered almost without exception to the Jews. Teaching was quite a different thing, and was given in private houses, and offered to private persons. The same way with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or “the breaking of bread” (*fractio panis*), the name by which it was known even in the days of the Apostles.

But these Gospel converts, if we may so style those who were converted by the Apostles, were treated by God, and therefore by His Church, in a different manner from those who became converts later on. God wanted to fill His Church; and, like those flowers and fruits that we read of in northern climes, which from the previous intense cold and the present blissful heat, suddenly burst forth into premature ripeness and bloom, they were all at once filled, as we read, with the Holy Ghost, and became illuminated from on high. St. Liguori says, that there was more love offered to God in the first century of the Church, than there was in all the preceding centuries of the world. Now, these were all at once admitted into the secret mysteries of the Church: for,

in the words of the Sacred Text, "what man would dare to call common, whom the Lord hath made clean?"

"In times of persecution, the Christians were afraid to speak openly and plainly about their worship and doctrine, from the natural fear that such disclosure would expose them to further injury and interruption. They were mindful of our Lord's admonition not to cast pearls before swine; and of the Apostle's declaration that he fed the Corinthians with milk, not with strong meat, because they were not able to bear it."<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, how strangely far this practice was carried, may be inferred from the following passage in Cardinal Newman's *Development* :—

"The existence of this discipline in other respects is plain from the nature of the case, and from the writings of the Apologists [of Christianity]. Minucius Felix and Arnobius, in controversy with Pagans, imply a denial that they, the Christians, used altars; yet Tertullian speaks expressly of the *Ara Dei* in the Church. What can we say, but that the Apologists deny that altars *in the sense* in which they ridicule them, or that they deny that altars, such as the Pagan altars, were tolerated by Christians. And, in like manner, Minucius allows that there were no temples among Christians; yet they are distinctly recognised in the edicts of the Dioclesian era, and are known to have existed at a still earlier date."

So far then for the use, in a controversial point of view, of the liturgies: so far also for those circumstances and accidents which to an extent determined the form of those liturgies. The Holy Sacrifice was kept an absolute secret from the pagan world: to a portion of the sacred ceremonies the catechumens and others were admitted; to the sacrificial rites, none but the faithful.

Now, however, the question obtrudes itself—What about the authenticity of these documents? for, if they be not authentic, they are not credible as witnesses; or, if having been once authentic, they were exposed to interpolation or corruption, they immediately lose all right to faith as witnesses, even if still, on account of their great age, they be regarded with reverence.

The scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

<sup>1</sup> *Cath. Dict.*, Art. "Discipline of the Secret."

as has been already insinuated, were divided among themselves: they formed three classes, holding three several opinions.

1. The opinion common among the Greeks, regarding the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom is, that they were written by the great fathers themselves. This opinion found many followers among the Latin scholars.

2. That these liturgies were, indeed, written by these saints, but that they have not come down to us in the exact form in which they left the writers' hands, but suffered interpolations and additions on the way. Such great names as Baronius, Bellarmine, and others, are cited as holding this opinion.

3. That these liturgies were never written by these holy men: that they are brazen forgeries, and were stamped with these holy writers' names in order to give them a sanction with the populace. No name of note is given as holding this opinion, which is looked upon as untenable.

The opinion of Cardinal Perronius, that the liturgy, which we call of St. James, was the one commonly used at Jerusalem, and ascribed to that saint; that the liturgy of St. Mark was the one used at Alexandria, and ascribed to the Evangelist; those of Basil and Chrysostom, as the liturgies used throughout the patriarchate of Constantinople, seems to be one which carries with it a very large amount of probability. It has the advantage, at least, of being exposed to the fewest difficulties.

There are certain *data* for ascertaining the probable age<sup>1</sup> of these documents; and while we are engaged in ascertaining the age, we will find ourselves coming across reasons, which will help us towards establishing their authenticity also.

In this matter the history of Nestorianism becomes useful, as it helps towards ascertaining the age of the liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil; in this way. Nestorianism

<sup>1</sup> We assert with confidence that there was no written liturgy in the first three centuries . . . We are disposed to go further, and follow Le Brun to the full extent of his thesis; viz., that written liturgies did not exist for the first four centuries." *Cath. Dict.*, Art. "Liturgies."



was condemned at the Council of Ephesus in the year 431 A.D. Now it is with good reason conjectured that the Greek liturgies must have been committed to writing at some time previous to this. The conjecture is grounded on the fact that the Nestorians use the very liturgy of St. Chrysostom, even to the invocation of the Holy Spirit, *super dona proposita*—"transmutans ea Spiritu tuo Sancto"—and this invocation is to be found in none of the Greek liturgies except that of St. Chrysostom, in none of the Syrian liturgies, and in none of the Coptic. From 397 to 404, St. Chrysostom (it is well known) made additions and changes in the liturgy, as St. Ambrose in the Ambrosian rite of Milan; and this caused the liturgy to be called by his name. Now, the Nestorians, coming twenty or thirty years later on, and knowing in what repute his liturgy was with the faithful of those times, did for their own purposes preserve and observe the liturgy; and the fact of their using the identical liturgy of St. Chrysostom has made scholars conjecture that it must have been reduced to writing previous to that period.

In like manner the history and dates of the Monophysite heresy become useful to us in ascertaining the probable age of the liturgy of St. James. The Monophysites became known after a time under the name of the Jacobites, and their liturgy was the very liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem. If there was anything more than another that heresies in all ages have most bitterly and sensitively repelled, it is the charge of innovation, of introducing novelty. Not they, but the body they have left, that has introduced novelty; no body of men has ever been so maligned and injured; their *raison d'être* is because they protest against the errors of the old body; and novelty is but error in one of its various shapes. They have ever felt that an admission of novelty or change, on their part, is tantamount to a confession that they have strayed away from the path of their fathers, and therefore that they are in error. They are, in consequence, bound to lay claim to their being the inheritors and continuators of the true fold of all ages. This claim they are bound by their position to assert in season and out of season, and to be especially guarded not to allow the slightest semblance of

change to appear, especially in their public liturgy, for fear of alarming their followers, or of frightening off proselytes. And thus we find, in the case both of the Nestorians and the Jacobites, that they scrupulously observed to the letter the liturgies they had brought with them, admitting no addition, and enduring no change. The same conjecture with regard to the liturgy of St. James having been committed to writing before the appearance of the Monophysite heresy, and upon the same grounds, has been made by liturgical antiquarians, as in the case of the Nestorian heresy and the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.

In the case of these two liturgies we have additional ground for conjecture in the fact that St. Cyril of Jerusalem quotes from the liturgy of St. James in his Catechism; and St. Chrysostom quotes from the Greek liturgy in his Homilies to the people: a thing which neither would in all probability have done, if the liturgies from which they quote had not been already reduced to writing; and, in fact, well known to the people whom they were addressing.

In the case of the liturgy of St. Mark, proper to Alexandria, it is conjectured that it must have been committed to writing before the Council of Chalcedon, and before the split among the faithful of Alexandria over the Eutychian heresy: for, even after the lapse of centuries the orthodox and heretical churches are found using the same liturgy--the orthodox reading the liturgy in the Greek, the heretical in the Coptic or vernacular language. It need hardly be pointed out that the orthodox did not take their liturgy from the heretical; nor, on the other hand, would the heretical take it from the orthodox. It therefore remains, that the liturgy must have existed before the division, and in all likelihood been reduced to writing; as we go on to see.

It may be said, why could not the seceding party retain their liturgy quite as intact for generations, without having it reduced to writing, and trusting solely to men's memory, as the Church herself confessedly did for the first three centuries. It is possible that one or a second generation may preserve a liturgy so intact: but it is obvious that true faith, with its stern and stringent obligations, was one of the

great means, on the part of the Church, together with a special divine protection, to preserve these liturgies incorrupt through the memories of men for several centuries. Remove the great safeguard of faith, take away its power over the conscience and the exacting and rigorous compliance with even the letter that it demands, and it is obvious that the memory will be less upon its guard; that generations will assuredly witness changes; that the rites and language will suffer innovations; and that the liturgy will be materially altered, unless the original *littera scripta manet*. And if this remains, it can at once be appealed to by the opponents on either side to prove the deviation of the lapsing party.

Hear what they cried in the Council of Chalcedon, as it is somewhat kindred to our subject. The fathers all, sitting in council, in their second session, listened in silence while the doctrinal letter of Pope Leo to the holy patriarch Flavian of Constantinople was being read, and then all at once they explained:—"That is the faith of the fathers. That is the faith of the Apostles. So we all believe. Peter has spoken through Leo."

There then was, and there still is, a decided inclination on the part of the Church to cling to and use forms and phrases which have been consecrated by long usage, as witness the dogmas of succeeding councils. "Even when a phrase is not easy to translate, the identity is preserved; for instance, the clause "*in rebus et fidei, ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium*," not "*pertinentibus*," is found in both councils (the Vatican and Tridentine)."<sup>1</sup>

Now, what has been said goes far to induce, if not to establish, credence in the authenticity of the liturgies. If by any possibility it could at that time have been proved that the Church had corrupted or interpolated these documents, no accusation would have been so immediately and so directly cast in her face by her opponents; and it must be remembered that she had bitter and unsparing opponents from the very beginning. Every schism or heresy was bound to accuse her, and put her in the wrong, in order that itself would appear to be in the right.

<sup>1</sup> Newman, *Insp. of Scrip.*

The argument is thus put by Renaudot: "between the faithful and the Nestorian and Jacobite heretics, there were many disputes about points of faith; and some of the writings regarding these controversies have come down to our time. Let Protestants put forward even one author worthy of credence who will bear testimony that the Nestorians or Jacobites were ever charged with introducing any change in the Eucharistic Office, of introducing among the prayers the names of the saints, and particularly of the Blessed Virgin, of invoking over the *Oblata* the name of the Holy Spirit,<sup>1</sup> or of mingling water with wine."

They were not accused of these things, although they did them, because these things were from the beginning. But we will see what they were accused of:—

The Greeks [after our Renaudot] began to calumniate the Latins *de Azymis*, which the Melchites, who follow the Greek Church observed. The Egyptian Jacobites accused the Syrian Jacobites of novelty, though they were both of the Monophysite heresy, because the latter added some salt and oil to the *Oblata*; and all inveighed most bitterly against the Armenians, because they omitted to mingle water with the chalice. Nay, Daron, the orthodox Bishop of Armenia, accused the Jacobites of introducing new liturgies, although these liturgies were after the form and substantially the same as those received among the orthodox; and Balsamon was of opinion that the liturgies called of Mark and of James ought to be suppressed, because they were not identical in all things with those commonly received. But what would have been the outcry if these had no more in common with the ancient liturgies than has the service of the Supper with Protestants of to-day? If then, even in antiquity, there so strong to the ancient discipline, that the slightest deviation from it was looked upon as a grave crime, how can anyone suppose that in great things, and especially in the disposition of the sacred office, they would have been so remiss as, in all unquitting and without protest, to alter a corrupted and superstitious form of worship to be introduced instead of the ancient apostolic ritual and liturgy?"

We now turn to one of those ancient liturgies used among the Copts, the liturgy of St. Basil; and see in a brief survey what evidence it is able to give of a belief in the adorable Eucharist in its day? It goes without saying that

<sup>1</sup> See Franzelin, *De Eucharistia*; Thesis vii., de *Invoc. Sp. Sanc.*



these old liturgies are extremely devotional and touching ; but that *en parenthese*. The liturgy begins with *Oratio Preparationis* ; then a prayer *postquam preparatum fuit altare* ; then a prayer of thanks to God that they have been privileged to assist at this holy sacrifice, which is followed by a prayer of the *Oblation or Proposition of the Host and Chalice* ; and this we quote :—

“ O Lord Jesus Christ, only-begotten Son, Word of God the Father, consubstantial and co-eternal with Him and the Holy Ghost ; Thou art the living Bread, who didst descend from heaven and forestall us, and didst lay down Thy perfect and sinless soul for the life of the world ; we pray and beseech Thy goodness, O lover of men, turn Thy face on this host and this chalice, which we have laid on this Thy sacerdotal table ; bless them ✠, sanctify them ✠, and consecrate them ✠ ; change them, that even this bread become Thy holy Body, and this mingled in the chalice Thy precious Blood, that they may be to us,” &c.

We pass over many things in the liturgy, which are highly interesting because of their similarity to the ceremonies of the High Mass, and come to the Consecration :—

*Deacon*.—Approach and attend, O men, with fear.

*People*.—Mercy, peace, and sacrifice of praise.

*Priest*.—Dominus vobiscum.

*People*.—Et cum spiritu tuo.

*Priest*.—Sursum levate corda vestra.

*People*.—Habemus ad Dominum.

And so on, like our Preface :—

*Priest*.—He instituted this great mystery of piety and religion when He determined to give Himself up to death for the life of the world.

*People*.—We believe in truth that it is so.

*Priest*.—He took bread into His hands, holy, pure, immaculate, blessed and life-giving, and looked up to heaven to Thee, O God, His Father, and the Lord of all.

“ Then he will take the ablution in his hands, and will remove the veil from the chalice.”

*People*.—Amen.

“ The priest will raise his eyes, saying ” :—

*Priest*.—And gave thanks, ✠

*People*.—Amen.

*Priest*.—And blessed it.

*People*.—Amen.

"The priest will mark the oblation thrice with his finger."

*Priest.*—And sanctified it. ✠

*People.*—Amen.

"The priest will divide the Host into three parts, and will so put them together again, that they be not separate; which when done, he will rub his fingers over the chalice, lest any of the *Oblata* may cling to them, and will say":—

And broke it, and gave to His holy disciples and apostles, saying, Take and eat ye all of this. *Hoc est enim corpus meum quod pro vobis frangitur, et pro multis datur in remissionem peccatorum, hoc facite in meam commemorationem.*

*People.*—Amen.

"The same way with the chalice; and as soon as the consecration of the chalice is over":—

*Deacon.*—*Adorate Deum cum timore et tremore.*

Finally, we turn to a canon in this liturgy which is most striking—striking indeed, to any mind, but perhaps most striking of all, and suggestive, to the mind of a priest.

It is entitled *Cura Reliquarum Eucharisticarum*, and thus runs:—

"After Communion, however, has been distributed, a like care is taken, that no little portion remain, nor anything in the chalice, regarding which various ordinances stand in *Canonibus sacre lancelis*. Let priests and deacons, therefore, diligently take care, lest there be any residuum of the Sacred Eucharist, and that thus, like the sons of Aaron, they incur a grave judgment.

[And if any remained—most like through the negligence of the priest—because it says the sons of Aaron negligenter ministrabant sacrificia Deo oblata; and then adds], *quanto vero id magis melius tam est illis qui negligenter se habent erga Corpus et Sanguinem Christi Domini.* In the Canonical Responses [it goes on] it is asked, If the Particle be found, after the priest has taken water, can It be consumed by him? *Negatur; sed statuitur*—that It be brought to some priest or deacon, who has received Communion, but as yet has not taken water, or to some lay person, if no other be found fasting. But if none at all, the priest shall put the Particle found by him in *disco*, shall cover the paten with it, veils, shall light around It two wax candles and a lamp towards the east, and the priest himself shall assume the custody of that Body (*Vnus Corporis*) until the following day; when, on the celebration of the liturgy, he, fasting, shall

receive It performing no other function at the altar (*nullo fungens ad altare ministerio*). These things being done, he shall perform a most severe penance (*durissimam penitentiam*) on account of his negligence towards the Body and Blood of the Son of God, *qui effusus est pro salute creaturarum*. But if he cannot devote himself to the custody of the Sacred Body on account of his watch in the preceding night<sup>1</sup> (*quæ antecessit Liturgiam*) he is permitted to join to himself another priest or deacon."

Elsewhere, also, it is commanded:—

"Sacerdos postquam discum diligenter abstersit, et calicem abluit, dicat—let him say if any Member, that is, any Particle of the Body of Christ, shall have remained, let It remain commended to Thy knowledge who created the world. Be Thou, O Lord, Its guardian; and be merciful to us."

Oh, how full of rich blessedness to the mind of the priest is the thought, that we are carrying on the selfsame adorable sacrifice that was offered by saints and holy priests ages and ages ago.

R. O'KENNEDY.

## THE DIOCESE OF ELPHIN.

1671-1717.

WRITING in former numbers of the I. E. RECORD, some chapters in the early life of Charles O'Connor, of Belinagare, I gave an account of Dr. O'Rorke, Bishop of Killala (1707-1742).<sup>2</sup> The hunted life led by this accomplished prelate, to whom Charles O'Connor chiefly owed his education, gives us a glimpse at the practical working of the Penal Laws during the eighteenth century. A man of princely lineage, who had passed his early years in affluence and ease, a finished scholar, who had dwelt in courts and conversed with kings and emperors, he spent a great part of his life amid the bogs and mountains of Connemara, trying as best he could to guard and guide, by stealth, the flock

<sup>1</sup> *Ob præcedentem vigiliam noctis*; this gives us an idea as to the meaning of the word *vigil* with us.

<sup>2</sup> See I. E. RECORD, 3rd Series, vol. vi., page 560.

committed to his care; glad to share at night, the poor peasant's cabin, often without even such wretched shelter. For then, indeed,

“ Among the poor, or on the moor,  
Were hid the pious and the true;  
While traitor knave and recreant slave,  
Had riches, rank, and retinue.”<sup>1</sup>

The Bishop of Charles O'Connor's own diocese of Elphin was, at that time, Dr. Ambrose M'Dermot, who was consecrated in the same year as Dr. O'Rorke. He was of the ancient family of M'Dermot Roe, the branch to which he belonged, residing in the neighbourhood of Lanesborough, County Roscommon. He received his early education in the Dominican Convent of St. Patrick, at Tulsk, in the County of Roscommon, and Diocese of Elphin. This Dominican Priory of Tulsk was founded by the M'Dowels (*prænobili viro M'Daily*) of Mantua, where the Dowel Graces still reside, near Elphin, in the year 1448. The walls of the church, and the ruins of the monastery still stand. Two beautiful and admirably-executed arches remain perfect. The stone casings of the east window are entire; the mullions are gone. The tomb of the M'Dowel family, with a long and well-written Latin inscription, is to be seen. There was also, in those days, a castle in Tulsk. The lands about where it stood are still called Castlelands. It was one of the strongest places in the county, and was built by O'Connor Roe, about the year 1406, according to the Annals of Lough Ree. Of this castle, frequent mention is made in the Annals of Ireland. From “the fortifications of Tulsk, in 1593, Sir Richard Bingham Governor of Connaught, sent a party of cavalry to scour the country, which encountered the cavalry of Hugh McGuire on his march from Boyle. In the skirmish which ensued, Edmund Magauran, the Primate, who accompanied Maguire, was slain at Skea-na-Vart (*scutum miraculorum*), the present townland of Skea, near Elphin.”

Up to the Union, the borough of Tulsk returned two

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Davis.



members to the Irish Parliament. The constituency must have been extremely limited. De Burgo describes it as "Pagus usque adeo exiguus, hisce saltem temporibus (1756) ut quamquam municipium sub vigore regii diplomatis, nullum tamen ibi videre est fori aut mercatus exercitium:" a description which accurately sets forth its present state.

M'Dermott was a distinguished scholar, and was soon called to Rome, where he taught arts and theology for many years in the Irish Dominican Convent of SS. Clement and Sixtus, of which House he was prior from 1686 to 1689. He was afterwards transferred to the College of the Apostolic Penitentiaries of the Siberian Basilica of St. Mary Major's. In the General Chapter of the Dominican Order, held in Rome, Father M'Dermott represented Ireland. He was appointed bishop of his native diocese by Clement XI., in 1707. Measures were taken to conceal this appointment from the English Government, for persecution then raged violently in Ireland, and for bishops, especially, there was no mercy. Father M'Dermott was, therefore, consecrated in Rome with the greatest possible privacy. Nevertheless, such was the perfection of the English spy-system of that day, his consecration, and every circumstance connected with it, was immediately known by the Queen's ministers in England. The very day on which Dr. M'Dermott reached London, and on his way to his diocese, he was arrested and cast into prison. He was many times questioned as to his episcopal dignity; he answered always in Italian. An Italian apostate, in the pay of the Government, was then called in, and, although he recognised the Bishop, having known him at Rome as Penitentiary of St. Mary Major's, yet wishing to favour his escape, he declared that from his speech he judged him to be an Italian. At length, Dr. M'Dermott was summoned into the presence of one of the chief ministers of the Council, who told him that although he pretended to be an Italian, they were fully aware that he was an Irishman: that his name was Ambrose M'Dermott, formerly Penitentiary of St. Mary Major's, in Rome, now titular Bishop of Elphin, in Ireland; that he had been consecrated in Rome on such a day, in such a month, by such a Cardinal

in his own palace, assisted by such and such bishops. He was then sent back to prison, and afterwards exiled to Belgium, with the threat of certain death if he should return, or ever attempt to go to Ireland.

But this noble prelate, a man of truly apostolic heart, willing, as the Good Pastor, to lay down his life for his sheep, soon returned by another route from Belgium to Ireland, and to his diocese. There he watched continually over his flock, labouring with his persecuted priests, who in want, and cold, and hardship, ceased not to strengthen and support their afflicted people, to administer to them the sacraments, and confirm them in the faith. Dr. M'Dermott died worn out by ten years of such persecution and labour, a true confessor of the faith, in the year 1717, at Cloontuskert,<sup>1</sup> in his diocese of Elphin, county of Roscommon, the native place of his family, and was buried there in the ancient abbey of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine.<sup>2</sup>

The predecessor of Dr. M'Dermott in the see of Elphin was the illustrious Dominick De Burgo, or Burke, of the family and the near relative of the Earl of Clanrickarde. He was in youth a pupil of the Dominican convent of Athenry, where he received the habit of the Order. The difficulties then experienced by Irish youths in escaping to the Continent in quest of knowledge denied them at home, are exemplified in his early life. For when he sought to complete his education in Spain, he was captured on sea by the English. They robbed him of his money and outfit, and carried him to Kinsale, where they cast him into prison. From this dungeon the youth made his escape by leaping from the top of the prison wall into the soft slime left by the receding tide. He crept into a neighbouring wood, where he lay hid for two days, covered to the neck with slime, without food or drink. At length he managed, with great difficulty, to

<sup>1</sup> Cluain-tuaischt-ne-Sinua, *i.e.*, the northern town, plain, or insulated meadow of the Shannon. This townland of Cloontuskert lies along the west bank of the Shannon. St. Faithlee was the patron of the locality. The monastery of the Canons Regular was dedicated to St. Anne. The ruins still remain. The tombs of the O'Haulys and other chiefs are in the chancel.

<sup>2</sup> Vide *Hibernia Dominicana*, c. xiii., page 499, *et seq.*

reach the house of a Catholic family named Roche. Here he was most kindly received and hospitably entertained until he recovered his strength. His generous host then furnished him with money and suitable apparel; and he was thus enabled to reach his mother's house, to her great surprise and alarm. She besought him in vain not to expose himself to the dangers of another such voyage. His love of study and desire to devote himself in the sacred ministry to the service of his afflicted country prevailed over maternal affection and love of home. He soon after embarked at Galway, and this time reached Spain in safety, and devoted six years to study in the Dominican Convent of Holy Cross at Segovia. He afterwards filled the highest positions in the Dominican Order, in different cities of Italy, where for sixteen years he was held in the highest order for his piety, zeal, learning, and prudence. He was especially loved and esteemed by the learned and illustrious Julius Vincent Gentili, Provincial of Lombardy, and afterwards archbishop.

Father Burke was master of novices in the Convent of St. Dominic, at Venice. He had under his charge Brother Vincent Mary Ursines, afterwards (1742) Pope Benedict XIII., who received the habit of St. Dominic in this convent. This Pontiff frequently visited the Irish Dominican Convent of St. Sixtus in Rome, sometimes once a week. He conversed familiarly with the monks, treating De Burgo especially, afterwards author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, and Bishop of Ossory, with the most affable kindness.

In the year 1729 the Pope spent the ten days before Ash Wednesday on retreat at the Irish convent. He was present with the monks in choir day and night, and in the refectory fared as the humblest brother of them all. He received the discipline with the other brothers after the recitation of the Litany of the Saints, according to the custom of the Order, from the Hebdomadarius, Father Michael MacDonogh, of Ballindoon, in the county of Sligo, and diocese of Elphin. The author of the *Hibernia Dominicana* tells us,<sup>1</sup> that the

<sup>1</sup> *Hibernia Dominicana*, page 497, note i.

holy Pontiff frequently spoke to him of his old master, Dominic De Burgo, whom he had known at Venice, and remembered well for his great learning and admirable virtues. Father Burke was afterwards master of novices in the magnificent ducal Convent of St. Mary of Grace, at Milan. He was, most unexpectedly as regarded himself, raised to the see of Elphin by Pope Clement X., in the year 1671, the forty-first of his age. He was consecrated at Ghent, and returned immediately to his diocese. For thirty-three years he discharged his high office in suffering and danger, in word and example the model of his flock.

In 1680 a reward of £200 was offered for his apprehension by the Lord Lieutenant (the Duke of Ormond) and Privy Council. A proclamation issued the same year ordered that parish priests should be apprehended and transported, upon any robbery or murder being committed in their respective parishes, unless the criminals were killed, taken, or discovered within fourteen days. Dr. Burke could henceforward venture out of his hiding-places to discharge his duties only by night. For four consecutive months he lay hid in a solitary house in a remote district, never venturing outside the door. When Holy Thursday approached he walked forty miles, always travelling by night, to consecrate the sacred oils. The Dominican, Father John O'Heyne, who has given an account of the Bishop's life, was his companion during the whole of that year. When the martyr-primate, Oliver Plunkett, was a prisoner in Dublin, he managed to convey to the Bishop of Elphin information of the plans of the Privy Council for his capture, and he was thus enabled to escape their blood-stained hands, and the fate of the great and good Archbishop.

Dr. Burke, like all his colleagues in the Irish episcopacy was poor. Archbishop Plunkett declared at his trial that his "income never exceeded threescore pounds per annum." The Bishop of Elphin received no oblations from clergy or laity, but he lived on a farm given to him by the Earl of Clanrickarde, I believe at Glynsk, within his diocese, in the County Galway. In his residence there, when there was any lull in the persecutions, he exercised a gracious and



generous hospitality after the custom of the primitive Church. He was, O'Heyne tells us, most devout to the Blessed Virgin; and besides the Canonical Office, he fervently recited the entire Rosary every day, and very frequently twice a day. He was much honoured and loved by James II. and his queen.

Driven at length from his diocese, he lived for a time in Galway. When he was forced finally to transport himself from his country, he refused an abbey offered to him by Louis XIV., in France; and preferring the poverty of his Order, he found refuge in the Dominican Convent of Holy Cross at Louvain. From this he addressed letters to the Pope, the Catholic princes of Europe and their ambassadors then assembled to conclude the peace of Ryswick, detailing the persecutions of the Catholics in Ireland. In the same year (1697) he published some of the Acts of Parliament passed against the clergy, with a preface; and a supplicatory epistle to the Pope, in response to which Innocent XII. issued two briefs in favour of the Irish Catholics. He also solicited from the Pope absolution from the presumed excommunication which some of the people of Ireland were believed to have incurred, in the time of the Apostolic Nuncio Rinuccini. Others who had made the same request did not obtain this favour. It was granted to the Bishop of Elphin (about the year 1698), and thirty-three Apostolic Bulls to that effect were addressed to the dioceses of Ireland.

The Dominican Convent of Louvain was at this time in a ruinous condition, and the community removed from it, that it might be rebuilt. Bishop Burke went to the Irish Franciscan Convent of St. Anthony in the same city, where he was most gladly and hospitably received by his compatriots, and where he ended his days in peace. He rested, in Christ, at St. Anthony's, after his long life of labour and suffering, endured for God and His Church, on the 1st of January, 1704, aged 75 years, having made the profession of faith, received the Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction, retaining the full use of reason and speech to the last moment. He was buried in the chapel of the Irish

Franciscans, near the high altar, where an elegant marble tablet bears the following inscription:—

D. O. U.  
HIC JACET UT VOLUIT,  
ILLUSTRISSIMUS AC REVERENDISSIMUS D. FR. DOMINICUS DE BURGO,  
NOBILIS FAMILIAE, EX S. ORDINE PRAEDICATORUM,  
EPISCOPUS ELPHINENSIS IN HIBERNIA,  
QUI PRO DEO, AC REGE SUO PLURIMA PASSUS,  
PROFUGUS OBIIT IN HOC COLLEGIO LOVANIENSI  
S. ANTONII DE PADUA FRATRUM MINORUM HIBERNORUM,  
DIE I ANNI MDCCIV, ET AETATIS LXXV.  
R. I. P. A.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps, having given these examples of the lives of the bishops during the Penal times, we may briefly refer to another illustrious son of the Convent of Tulsk, in those evil days—Father Felix MacDowel, one of the family of its founder. Having received his early training in Tulsk, he finished his studies at Valladolid in Spain. He afterwards taught Philosophy in Sardinia. Transferred to Rome, he was one of the seven Dominicans who received possession for the Order of the Convent of SS. Sixtus and Clement. In 1680 he was appointed Prior of this House, just granted to the Irish nation, and by his zeal and example brought it to the most exact standard of regular observance. He returned to Ireland, then sorely in need of such missionaries.<sup>2</sup> In the war between James and William he was chaplain in one of the Irish regiments. After the defeat of the Jacobite cause, he escaped beyond seas, and lived for a time in England, watching his opportunity to return to Ireland. He

<sup>1</sup> See *Hibernia Dominicana*, page 496, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> It may be of interest to give here the bishops of Elphin from the episcopacy of this illustrious confessor.

Dominic De Burgo, or Burke (Dominican) . . . . .	1671—1704
Ambrose M'Dermott (Dominican) . . . . .	1707—1717
Patrick French (Franciscan) . . . . .	1718—1747
John Brett (Dominican) translated from Killala . . . . .	1748—1756
James Fallon . . . . .	1759—1775
Edmund French . . . . .	1800—1810
George Thomas Plunkett . . . . .	1815—1827
Patrick Burke, Coadjutor 1819, succeeded . . . . .	1827—1844
G. I. P. Browne, translated from Galway . . . . .	1844—1858
Laurence Gillooly, Coadjutor 1857, succeeded . . . . .	1858 <i>fel. reg.</i>

succeeded at length ; but had scarcely reached Dublin when he was cast into prison, and held in the closest confinement, where this holy confessor, and in truth martyr, died for the faith of Christ, on the 3rd of February, 1707.

We are from time to time admonished to let those ancient wrongs sink for ever into oblivion ; to lay aside the remembrance

“ Of old, unhappy, far-off things,  
And battles long ago,”

and enjoy and bless the peace and freedom of our better days. Having been robbed of all that could be taken from us by force or fraud, it is sought to deprive us also of the memory of the dead. But a higher authority bids us remember our prelates who have spoken the word of God, and call to mind the former days of suffering and sorrow. “ What we have been makes us what we are.” And ungrateful should we be, if we forgot the prelates and the priests who, transported, returned again and again in the face of danger and of death ; who freely died on the gallows tree, or endured the loathsome dungeon’s more lingering doom, or the life-long suffering of homeless, hunted outlaws, to preserve the faith in the hearts of the people. Neither should the heroic devotion of that people be forgotten ; of those who, in hut or hall, at the risk of life and land, sheltered the ministers of God ; nor the generous pity of Protestants, who often received and saved the hunted priest, when the bloodhounds were on his track, and every other refuge failed him. Not in bitterness or hate do we read and remember the history of those Penal days, but in heartfelt gratitude to the God of our fathers, and in reverent homage to the memories of those confessors and martyrs, and of the noble people who, despoiled and dishonoured, clung to them with changeless affection for their heroic constancy and deathless love.

If those who in this century have so successfully laboured to replace the scattered stones of the sanctuary, to repair the material ruin of our Irish Church, to restore its external grace and splendour, deserve our gratitude and praise, how

much more should we honour and revere the memories of the men who, resisting unto blood, through centuries of suffering, preserved from ruin, through God's grace, the spiritual edifice of the faith in the souls of the people, and made this modern renovation possible. Surely, the priesthood of Ireland shall never cease to recall with grateful emotion their predecessors in the sacred ministry, who have left them an example that they should walk in their footsteps; whose heroic devotion, constancy, and courage, have won from the Protestant historian Lecky the generous tribute: "No body of men has ever exhibited a more single-minded and unworldly zeal, refracted by no personal interests, sacrificing to duty the dearest of earthly objects, and confronting with undaunted heroism every form of hardship, of suffering, and of death." May their spirits still be powerful intercessors for us before the throne of God, to guide and guard us, priests and people, true to that faith for which they lived and died, through dangers different from, but no less real than, those of their own dark days. We have witnessed the fulfilment of the prayer of our great apostle, that

"Conquering foe

Trampling this land, should not tread out her faith,  
Nor sap by fraud."<sup>1</sup>

May we and those who are to follow us witness also that greater boon demanded by the saint, and promised him at last by Victor, God's angel, on his holy mount:—

"Though every nation, ere that day,  
Recreant from creed and Christ, old troth forsworn,  
In pride of life the scandal of the cross  
Should flee, as once the Apostles fled in fear;  
This nation of my love, a priestly house,  
Beside that cross shall stand, fate-firm, like him  
That stood beside Christ's Mother."<sup>2</sup>

J. J. KELLY.

<sup>1</sup> Aubrey De Vere, *The Striving of St. Patrick on Mount Crucchan*, page 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, page 47.



“HORÆ LITURGICÆ:” OR STUDIES ON THE MISSAL  
 “PROPRIUM DE TEMPORE.”—VII.

ADVENT.

THE Church's year sets before us “Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever” (Heb. xiii. 8), and we see Him, not only in the days of His mortal life, but as the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world (Apoc. xiii. 8), as existing before Abraham was (cf. St. John viii. 58), and now in heaven “ever living to make intercession for us” (Heb. vii. 25). So fittingly does Holy Church begin her year with a season recalling that time in the world's history when men were looking for the promised redemption of Israel (cf. St. Luke xxiv. 21); when they prayed that God would rend the heavens and come down (cf. Is. lxiv. 1), and that the Desire of the eternal hills should appear (cf. Gen. xlix. 26); when they were looking for the fulfilment of the gracious promise that God Himself would come to save them (cf. Is. xxxv. 4); when in the midst of the strife of warring sects the godly looked for the Teacher like unto Moses Whom that great lawgiver had foretold (cf. Deut. xviii. 15, 18), and awaited the day when the Virgin should conceive and bear a Son Whose name shall be called Emanuel, which is God with us (Is. vii. 14).

In this season then of Advent we are bidden by our holy Mother to take ourselves back in spirit to that time of waiting for the coming of our Lord, and to fill our heart with that same sweet longing desire the saints of old had to see the face of the Promised One. We by His mercy have seen His day, and have been made glad therein (cf. St. John viii. 56), and have known Him in the breaking of bread (cf. St. Luke xxiv. 35); but if the spiritual life is, on our side, a continual going towards God, it is also, on His side, a never-ceasing coming towards us, according to His own blessed words: “If any man love Me . . . We will come to him” (St. John xiv. 23); and these other words of the beloved disciple, “Both the Spirit and the Bride say, Come” (Apoc. xxii. 17). But on the greater feasts, such

as Christmas, there is a more abundant outpouring of grace, and our divine Lord mystically renews year by year the mystery of the Feast we celebrate ; for as He was yesterday, so is He to-day, ever new, ever old. Hence He comes to us in a different way and with different graces at Christmas from what He does at Easter ; and, if we may so dare to say, the mystery of the Crib reveals other aspects of His adorable character which are not seen so clearly in the glories of His victory over sin and death. So it is that many souls have been led to feed themselves on the thought of the sweet Babe of Bethlehem, whilst others find their spiritual nourishment in meditating on the Man of Galilee and Judea ; or on the Victim of Calvary ; or, again, on the glorified Saviour. For the contemplation of each mystery meets a certain want in individual souls which cannot be filled by the thought of any other mystery ; and the Holy Ghost, Who breatheth where He listeth (cf. St. John iii. 8), leads us on by His secret attraction to that one particular mystery wherein our soul can find its delight in the manifestation of our Lord's virtues and dispositions. But as Holy Church is the fruitful mother of many children, she is careful to meet the wants of all by bringing before them during the course of the year the whole history of her Divine Spouse ; and she would have us bear in mind that as His Mystic Body is the same to-day as it was in ages past, and as it ever will be, so is He always the same, always the Babe of Bethlehem, always the Child and Youth of Nazareth, always the Man of Galilee and Judea, always the Victim of the Father's justice, and always our risen Lord. He was foreseen from all eternity as the Lamb slain for the sins of the world, as the Divine Sacrifice ; and that Sacrifice which was consummated on Calvary included and embraced every moment of His mortal life ; for every moment entered distinctly into the offering of the Victim. It was the Victim of expiation that lay hid in Mary's sacred womb, that was wrapped in swaddling clothes in the manger ; that was borne away in the stillness of the night on towards Egypt ; that was lost for three days in Jerusalem ; that was bidden at Nazareth ; that taught and worked wonders ; that was contradicted, opposed, blasphemed,

betrayed into the hands of ruthless enemies, and put to death. So as throughout all His life He was ever seen by the Eternal Father as the Victim, so now that the Sacrifice is always being renewed, and God is ever being worshipped, therefore still sees He in the Eucharistic Victim the same Babe, Youth, Man, Victim, and Victor that was seen before ; for “ Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and evermore ” (*ut supra*) ; the glory He gave to His Father in each phase of His mortal life stands out clear and distinct, and is ever a perfect act of the most supreme and satisfying worship to the Godhead.

We have dwelt a little on this point for the purpose of showing that the Church’s seasons and feasts are not bare memories of past events, but are in very truth mystical renewals of them for our soul’s good. “ The gifts of God are without repentance ” (Rom. xi. 29). For instance, was that great gift that was given Christmas night to be confined only to the humble shepherds ? Are we, because we live so many hundred years after, to be deprived of the outpouring of grace and the sweet influence of that holy night ? No, surely not. Hence, like the prudent householder, the Church brings out from her treasure things new and old, and gives meat in due season to all her children. She makes her feasts a living reality to us, so that we can, year by year, receive the same benefits and graces we would have received had we been present in the flesh on the days when the mysteries were first wrought.

Now, as regards the time of Advent. We are called upon to prepare for the coming of the Babe on Christmas night. Nearly two thousand years ago He was born in a stable to save our race, and now on the fast-approaching festival He will come again and be born in the poor wretched stable of our heart. The world waited four thousand years, and, in sorrow of hope deferred, prepared for His coming ; so Holy Church has appointed four Sundays for the time of our preparation. Prayer and penance are our best preparation, so we see reflected in the Office and Mass many of the rites we have considered during the Lenten season. The holy Altar bears its purple dress ; the sacrificing priest with

his ministers are clad in the vesture of penance; the *Gloria* is hushed until we sing it again with the angels at the midnight Mass, and, together with it is silenced the joyful hymn, the *Te Deum*. The *Benedicamus Domino* takes the place of the customary *Ite Missa est*, as though to tell us that we must not cease, but give ourselves without interruption to the work of preparing for the coming of the Child. But the *dulce carmen*, Alleluia is not given up; for all joy is not banished, as during Lent, when we are oppressed with the thought of sin and its punishment. Perhaps in this sense of joy, which springs out of hope, we may find a little gleam of light upon the Scotist teaching, that in any case we should have had the joy of the coming of the Holy Child as the Great Religious and Adorer, as M. Olier loved to call Him, even if we were not to have had the infinite tenderness of the Man of Sorrows. Surely this is an echo of the Church's song of faith, “Who *for us men*, and for our salvation, came down from heaven,” wherein two motives are given for the Incarnation: one, that God might be with us, for His delight is to be with the children of men (Prov. viii. 31); and the other, that He might be the propitiation for our sins (1 John ii. 2).

As a help to us, we are reminded by the mystery of Advent, that there are three comings of our Blessed Lord, which we must ever keep in mind. As St. Bernard says:<sup>1</sup> “In the first He comes in the flesh and in weakness; in the second He comes in spirit and power; and in the third He comes in glory and majesty. His second coming is the means whereby we pass from the first even unto the third.” We may also with profit consider the beautiful words of Peter of Blois on the same subject: for we will find frequent references to the three comings of our Lord in the liturgy of this season. The holy abbot says: “There be three comings of our Lord: the first in the flesh, the second in the soul, the third at judgment. The first was at midnight. According to the words of the Gospel, ‘At midnight there was a cry made: Lo!

<sup>1</sup> Fifth Advent sermon.



the Bridegroom cometh’ (St. Matt. xxv. 6). But this first is indeed long since past, for the Christ ‘hath been seen on earth, and hath conversed among men’ (Baruch iii. 38). We be now in the second coming, provided that we be such as that He may thus come to us; for He hath said that if we love Him, He will surely come to us, and will even take up His abode in our heart.’ (Cf. St. John xiv. 23.) But this second coming is full of uncertainty for us; for who, save the Spirit of God, knoweth them that be of God (1 Cor. ii. 10)? They that be raised out of themselves, by the desire of heavenly things, know indeed when He comes; but whence He comes, or whither He goeth, they know not. As to the third coming, it is most certain that it will be, to us most uncertain when it will be; for nothing is more sure than death, and nothing less sure than it’s hour. ‘When they shall say, peace and security,’ says the apostle, ‘then shall sudden destruction come upon them, as the pains upon her that is with child; and they shall not escape’ (1 Thess. v. 3). So that the first coming was humble and hidden; the second is mysterious and full of love; and the third will be majestic and terrible. In His first coming the Christ was judged by men unjustly; in His second He maketh us just by His grace; in the third He will judge all things with justice. He was, in the first, a lamb; in the third He will be as a lion; and in the one between the two He is even the tenderest of friends.”<sup>1</sup> Bearing in mind, then, these comings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to reform the body of our lowliness (Phil. iii. 21), we will proceed to the consideration of the beautiful Masses, so full of lessons to us priests as to the fitting preparations for the Day of the Lord.

#### THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Our Holy Mother calls us to the altar with the invitation, “Come, let us adore the King Who is to come”—that heavenly Word Who, proceeding forth from the womb of the Eternal Father, in the passing course of time, is to be born for the world’s weal (cf. *Hymn. ad Mat.*). The Lamb, Who

<sup>1</sup> *De adventu, sermo iii.*

will pay our debts, is sent to us ; so let us all, with tears, pray His pardon, that when He comes in glory, and strikes the world with fear and dread, He may not punish us as guilty, but as a kind Saviour in that day guard us (cf. *Hymn. ad Laud*). We may note the frequent allusion to our ever dear and Blessed Lady in our Matins and Lauds ; and the Station for the Mass itself is kept as her great church in Rome. When we are considering the coming of the Babe, how can we forget the Mother ? When He does come, like the three kings we will find the Child with Mary His Mother (cf. St. Matt. ii. 11).

The Introit is from Ps. xxiv., which David wrote when, in the midst of tribulations, he thought of God's fidelity to His promises. “To Thee do I lift up my soul, O my God ; in Thee do I put my trust. Let me never be put to shame, nor let mine enemies exult over me ; yea, them that wait on Thee shall never be confounded. Thy ways, O, Lord, show unto me, and Thy paths teach Thou me.” In the midst of the darkness that covered the earth, and the gross darkness which beset the people (cf. Isaiah lx. 2), the soul of the godly looked up to the eternal hills whence cometh help (Ps. cxx. i.) ; and, kept up by the remembrance of the Promised One, waited patiently for the coming, knowing full well that evil would not triumph. To us the Introit is a cry of *sursum corda*, and a cheering one, during the time of our preparation for the day of His appearing. This, the very first lesson the Church gives us in the Missal, is a very necessary one ; for our most prevalent failing through the long years God gives us to prepare for His coming, is surely that of a sinking of the spirit, a desire to lie down, fainthearted and discouraged with life and with ourself : just to take one look back, like Lot's wife ; just to stop for a few moments. “To Thee do I lift up my soul,” with all its powers and thoughts ; up to Thee, far above the sordid cares which oppress me when musing on many things ; up to Thee, in the serener atmosphere which is round about Thy sacred throne, at the foot of which breaks the cloud which hangs so heavy, and lets the happy sunshine of Thy presence gladden me. Sometimes the way and

the path to Thee seems hard to find, for may be I forget the path is a narrow one,    Then I pray

“ Keep Thou my feet ; I do not ask to see  
The distant scene ; one step enough for me.”

But Thou wilt not leave me desolate ; Thou, in Thy own good time, wilt make the way clear to me, and “ teach me Thy path.” Such thoughts of holy hope as these the Church gives us in this Introit, in order that we may set out with sure hearts on our walk of preparation for the “ day of our visitation ” (cf. St. Luke xix. 44). Then, with our heart full of adoration to “ the God of all hope ” (Rom. xiv. 13), we worship the adorable Three in One Who looketh down from on high, and regardeth the lowly ones of the earth (cf. Ps. cxii. 5, 6).

The Collect is that lovely prayer of a soul which, laden with trials and encompassed with dangers, cries out to the Lord to stir up His power, and come to save ; for there is no help but in Him. If He protects us, we shall be snatched out of the danger which hangs over us ; and if He gives us liberty, we shall indeed be made free. We then remind the Most High that the mystery of the Incarnation was wrought in Mary’s most holy womb, and through her ; so we ask, in the work of preparation, to have her powerful intercession ; for we believe her indeed to be God’s own Mother, and we know that He cannot refuse her ; but says, as Solomon said to his mother, “ Ask on, my mother, for I will not say thee nay ” (3 Kings ii. 20). We then have a choice of prayers for either the whole of the Mystical Body, of which Mary is also the Mother, or for its Visible Head ; and this shows us the way by which the power of God is to come and save us ; that is, through the Sacraments of the Church and the infallible teaching of the Pope. The one shows us the way, and the other sets our feet in the path, and helps us on our journey to our last end.

The stirring words of St. Paul (Rom. xiii.) call upon us to be up and doing, and in earnest to set about our work of making ready the pathway for the coming Lord. The hour of sleep is gone, and the time for awakening has come ;

already is salvation close at hand ; nay it is even now, for our salvation is to be secured by the right use of the present moment. The past is not ours, it has gone into the darkness ; the future we cannot call our own, for it is in God's hands ; all the time we have in which to save our soul is *now*, the passing moment, which rushes along like a swift torrent carrying in its impetuous course all before it, our deeds bad and good, into the ocean of eternity. The night wherein we have slumbered is far spent, and the daybreak is hard bye ; that day in which all things will be revealed, and God will be justified before all His creatures. We can by His mercy cast off the works of sin, which darken our soul, and we have at hand the armour of light, which is a putting on and clothing ourself with the Blessed Jesus, becoming united to Him, and having our life hidden with Him in God (cf. Col. iii. 2) ; so that, as St. Paul says : " With Him we can do all things " (Phil. iv. 13).

Again the comforting words of the Introit come back to us for the Gradual. If we put on the Lord Jesus, and are living members of His Body, how can we be ever put to shame and confounded ? How can He leave us without showing us the way and the path which leads to Him ? So with trusting hearts we sing our Alleluia to His praise. We then cast a sigh after the home that awaits us, " when the expectation of the creature shall be revealed " (Rom. viii. 19). Jesus Who is coming is God's great Act of Mercy and Salvation, " for He shall save His people from their sins " (St. Matthew i. 21) ; so sing we Alleluia again for this overwhelming mercy.

The Gospel (St. Luke xxi.) is about the final coming of the Judge for which the other two comings are designed. Let us lift up our head, the oft-repeated prayer is being answered ! His kingdom is coming, and our redemption is at hand. If the waiting was long and the time was dreary, yet, oh joy ! the day of the Lord is coming. If evil seems now to triumph, and our God insulted with impunity by the wicked, oh ! grand thought, the hour cometh when He shall overcome His enemies and tread the wicked in the wine-press of His wrath, and shall trample them in His divine



fury (Isaias lxiii. 3). His justice will burst forth as the sun from behind a cloud, and He will right the wrong, and will manifest the secret designs of His providence on the grand day when God arises and His enemies are scattered (cf. Ps. lxiii.), and His adorable justice is vindicated. Then for us "who love His coming" (2 Tim. iv. 8) the winter of exile will be over and summer will be come. This generation of our mortal life will not pass but the kingdom of God will have come to us; and we have the solemn assurance of Him Who made heaven and earth, that although they will pass away, and a new heaven and earth be made (cf. Apoc. xxi. i.), yet that His blessed word will not pass, for "the truth of the Lord abideth for ever" (Ps. cxviii. 2).

The Offertory is a repetition of the same hopeful prayer as the Introit. We are about to offer the very cause of our eternal hope. The thought that God has given us such a Victim, One Who can so perfectly please Him, is another sure sign to us that we shall not be made ashamed, neither shall the enemy triumph over us. So with all confidence we approach the throne of grace, for Jesus, our Victim, hath made reconciliation for us with the Father.

Our Victim goes up in sacrifice before Him Who is the Beginning and End, the Alpha and Omega of all things; and, cleansing us by His power as we offer it, makes us still more pure in the sight of God. By sweet Mary's prayers we ask for an increase of faith, that we may get the fulness of salvation and the eternal joys which await those that "keep the faith" (cf. 2 Tim. iv.). We will get this faith if we adhere in one body to Christ, and are careful to keep the bond of unity in the oneness of spirit (cf. Eph. iv. 4), and remain under the loving mantle which Mary casts round him who is her Son's vicar on earth. This is the tenour of the secret prayers.

"The Lord will show His kindness, and our land will bring forth its fruit" (Ps. lxxxiv.). These words of the Communion, referring to the coming of the Christ Who is indeed the kindness of God towards man and earth's choicest fruit, have a deeper and fuller meaning to us now that He is within us. God is ready to do His part, and

shows His kindness by putting all the wealth of His almighty at our disposal, for Jesus is now our very own. The gracious promise, "Ask, and ye shall receive," is indeed now a blessed reality and a very truth; for He cannot refuse us anything, seeing that He has already given us Himself Who possesses all things. We must do our part; the land of our heart must bring forth its fruit, the fruit the Master loves to find when he goeth "into the garden of nuts to see the fruit of the valley, and to see whether the vines flourish and the pomegranates are budded" (Cant. vii. 4). His loving-kindness will bless our work, and gives the increase to what we plant and water. We must labour in the Garden in which He sets us to dress and keep it (cf. Gen. ii. 15); and when He lets us see, as He does from time to time, the encouraging signs of the budding of our fig-trees, we must lift up our hearts to Him in gratitude, for they are the sign that our redemption is not far off.

In the Post-Communion we are reminded that we have received of His bounty, so we are urged on to prepare fittingly for the hour when the Master will come to reckon with His labourers. This we shall best do by remembering that the work of Incarnation was achieved through the Passion and the Cross. By death, life came; so by dying to ourself by the practice of holy mortification we will live to Justice. The example of our ever-dear and blessed Lady dying to herself, and casting herself unreservedly into God's hands to fulfill His adorable will, is put before us for our encouragement. If her acceptance of God's will meant the ocean of dolours which deluged her soul, it also meant the torrents of unutterable bliss which is ever inundating her being as the reward. So will it be with us. Though the struggle will be hard, yet the Christ will so fill us with heavenly delight and confidence, that we will not fear the evil, for our faith gives us the victory; and the Lord will surely come and gather together all His flock, and will set them up in His Father's kingdom as a ransomed and purchased people. Thus is the strain of hope which begins this Mass carried on to the end.

## SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Throughout this Mass also there runs, as a thread of gold, the same song of hope, which is the natural feature of a period of waiting; and its gracious presence gives a grace and rest to the soul according to the words of the prophet, "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength" (xxx. 15). And why? "Because Thou dost solidly establish me in hope" (Ps. iv.). In our matins, the holy prophet, the fifth Evangelist, as he is called, the princely Isaias announces, in clear terms the coming birth and the future judgment. "And there shall come forth a Rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his root . . . and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him . . . with righteousness shall He judge the poor . . . and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked." What a blessed promise of hope! How the morning star of our new day has arisen in the Immaculate Conception which we keep now! It gives us the promise of the splendour of that day when God shall shine on our hearts by Jesus Christ. Let us bear in mind during this Mass that our ever-dear and blessed Lady is the "Cause of our joy," and is, as St. Jerome says in the lessons of the II. Nocturn, "The branch without knot which comes from the root of Jesse; the flower thereof being the blessed Saviour Himself," Who says in the Canticle of Canticles, "I am the flower of the field and lily of the valley." Then, in spirit of hope and heart full of abundant consolation, let us adore in the Eucharistic Sacrifice "the King Who is to come."

The Introit is from Isaias xxx, and at once strikes the chord of holy joy in our soul, which is here represented under the figure of the Jewish Church, which was the object of God's special love. "O people of Sion, lo! the Lord will come to save the nations; and the Lord will make heard in the joy of your hearts the glory of His voice. Ps. O thou that rulest Israel! Thou that leadest Joseph as a sheep." Here is our firm ground of confidence; for if God will come to save the nations who are not of the chosen people, will He neglect us whom He has chosen? We have His own blessed words spoken by the same holy prophet,

“God Himself will come to save us” (xxxv. 4). In the joy of our hearts will Jesus come, for His presence is the glory of the Divine Voice, the Eternal Word of the Father; and where He is there must ever be joy, deep and perfect, “a joy no man can take from us” (St. John xvi. 22). Sorrow of poor wounded love may indeed be our lot, and it may exist side by side with the heavenly joy, as it did in the heart of our blissful Mother of Sorrows, who, in the midst of her dolours, still kept up in her heart the joyous song of the *Magnificat*. For joy is a gift of the Holy Ghost, and must come with holy hope, which has its foundation in the Fatherhood of God, and being our Father, what joy there must be in our hearts, knowing what sort of Father He is! The want of joy is a sure sign that He is not with us, and that the devil has possession of our soul; and if the enemy is there, how can the glory of the voice of the Lord be heard, that glory of His voice which is also the approval of a good conscience; which bids us be of good cheer; and says to them that are of a fearful heart, “Be strong, fear not, behold your God will come” (Isaias, *ibid.*)? It is indeed a glorious voice, for it shows forth the wonders of God in the depths of His abasements, abyss calling upon abyss. “He who dwelleth in the highest regardeth the lowly things of the earth” (Ps. cxii. 6). He is the Ruler of His people, and leads them as a shepherd leads his flock, and gathers in His bosom the lambs, and gently leads those that are with young (cf. Isaias xl. 11). O loving Shepherd, we trust utterly in Thy boundless love, and hope for everything from Thee. Thou hast made Thyself our Ruler and Leader, and hence hast given us a claim to call on Thee to bow down Thine ear, and hearken to our prayer. This thought turns our heart to humble adoration to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and gives a new force to that ever-fresh song of worship which Holy Church so often offers to her God.

In the Collect we ask God to stir up our hearts to prepare well for His coming. Last Sunday we asked that He would come to save us; now we pray that our sluggish hearts may be moved to co-operate by our free will with His gracious designs. What a wonderful and awful mystery is free will.



That we should have the power to refuse to open our heart to the Divine Guest Who knocks for admission ; that God should reverence this terrible and yet most God-like attribute of being free. It shows that He values one free act of love towards Himself, and gets more glory from it than from the blind obedience which rules those beings who have not this gift. How true it is that love is the fulfilment of the law, not only of the law of the Ten Commandments, but the law of God’s own existence, as regards His creatures and His adorable glory. So this blessed gift is the way which we become more like to the Giver, and return to Him the highest glory. Hence we pray in this Collect that He would rouse our will by such powerful grace that it may be enticed and induced worthily to prepare for His coming. We may note in this Collect a reference to sin, which is the clog upon the exercise of our free will ; for the most perfect act of our will is when we turn to God, and love Him for Himself ; and sin, being a disorder, turns our will into other channels, and binds it, as it were, in chains which, wilfully borne, hinder us from doing that which is the most perfect exercise of this great power. Hence, by the power of grace, at the touch of God’s hand, our soul is stirred up and begins to tend towards Him Who is the true end of its existence, and the only object in which it can rest.

The Epistle (Rom. xv.) is one of St. Paul’s most beautiful passages of encouragement. The Holy Scripture is our true spiritual reading book, and contains the whole of spirituality ; for, like no other book, it was written by the Holy Ghost for an instruction that we may be made firm in hope. The Apostle points out the important fact that we have “ the consolation of the Scriptures ;” for in what book shall we find such comfort and such balm in time of sorrow as in God’s own Book ? Like the Jews, in the days of the Maccabees, we need no human consolation, “ having for our comfort the holy books that are in our hands ” (1 Macc. xii. 9). Patience is hope in exercise ; we are patient because we put our trust in a God Who is ever faithful and true. This patience, as St. Paul hints in speaking of the “ God of patience,” is one of the fruits of the Holy Ghost, and has its root in the hope which is made

apparent in the Incarnation of our Divine Lord. Therefore, we who are His members must be one with Him, and "in the one hope of our calling" (Eph. iv. 2) give honour to God under the loving title of "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Therefore, all looking to the same end, we must be, as our Lord was, ministers for the truth of God, and confirm by our lives the promises made to the fathers. . . . For, by preaching the mercy of God, our people are moved to love Him, and to place their hope in Him; and so as the Psalmist says, let us bear witness to His name (the name of Jesus, which is Saviour) among the people by the eloquent testimony of our own lives of hope, and by letting them see us rejoicing in hope; and, setting up "God alone" as the rule of our life, so win them to the divine service. What is all this but saying that the only way of fulfilling our pastoral ministry is by being faithful to "the one hope of our calling," by being true priests filled with the "princely spirit of the Christ; men full of joy and peace, in the possession of the true faith; men abounding in hope and abiding in charity by the power of the Holy Ghost.

The song of hope in the coming of Him Who will make all things new (cf. Apoc. xxi. 5) is carried on in the Gradual (Ps. xl. 12). "Out of Sion is the loveliness of His beauty, God shall come manifestly. Gather ye to Him His saints who seal His covenant by sacrifices." At the altar of God, Who renews our youth, shall we see the loveliness of His beauty, though shrouded for a while in the Eucharist veils; but still He is manifestly there, when we, His holy ones, seal His covenant of peace with mankind by the sacrifice of the new law. We are "saints" by an ordination in which we share in the ineffable priesthood of the Incarnate Word; we are "called to be saints," and are "holy to the Lord" by the abundant grace which comes to us from the altar. What sure grounds for hope then have we not got in the very fact that He has chosen us to be priests to our God, and has made Himself the portion of our lot and inheritance. The versicle reminds us of our first Mass when so full of joy we went up to the house of the Lord to pay Him the homage of the Divine Sacrifice. Ah! would that the fervour we

then had still remained with us ! Each morning we should renew our hope by “the things said unto us, let us go up into the house of the Lord.” Each morning we should come from the altar renewed in “the patience which hath a perfect work,” for all our means of sanctity, all our helps to perfection are to be found in the Mass ; and this adorable Sacrifice is the way in which God will manifestly come to us, and we go to Him. If we offer the Sacrifice *in spiritu humilitatis et animo contrito*, He will come to us from the heavenly Sion in all the loveliness of His beauty ; if we are careless and unworthy sacrificers, He will come in the terrors of His divine wrath to curse us for doing His work negligently.

The Gospel (St. Matt. ii.) shows us St. John Baptist sending two of his disciples to the Christ to get their hope confirmed. And how does the Divine Master answer them ? He points to His works as the surest grounds for their hope in Him ; for what He did was the fulfilment of the prophecies. Then our Lord, turning His discourse to the Jews, spoke of the Baptist as one firmly rooted in hope. He was not a reed shaken by the wind, not one trusting in earthly princes, but the Messenger of Hope, who going before the face of the King, bade the people be of good cheer, for the Lord God was at hand to save them.

The Offertory (Ps. lxxxiv.) tells us that God being turned towards us quickens us, and we, His people, rejoice in Him, for we trust Him utterly. We too have seen His works, and now on the threshold of the Holy of Holies, He turns towards us, and with the gracious promise of pardon gives life to our soul. Therefore, we pray Him to show His mercy towards us, that mercy which is the Saviour who is coming at the Consecration. God will do more than show Jesus to us ; He will give Him to us as our very own, as our very salvation. How we ought to abound in hope, having “the God of all hope” within our heart ! This is the true spirit in which we ought to approach the altar, for “charity hopeth all things” (1 Cor. xiii. 9) ; and in the Secret we confess that we have no merits of our own in which we can trust, but that all our hope is founded in His love for us and the love we would fain have for Him.

The Communion is a trumpet-call which, now that we are united to our Lord, stirs us up to renewed hope. “Arise, O Jerusalem, and stand on high, and see the joy which cometh to thee from thy God.” We must arise from despondency and faint-heartedness; we must stand upon the high rock of God’s promises; and then, our hearts expanded with hope, we shall see in all its beauty the joy which God has brought with Him into our hearts as a fore-taste of the never-ending joy of the Communion Feast which awaits us in heaven. In the Post-Communion we pray that we, having been filled with heavenly food, may be taught by our Divine Master not to set our hope on things of this earth, but to dispose them and hold them at their true value. We ask Him also to teach us to love in their place the gifts He has in store for us, so that where our real treasure is there may be our hearts: *ut ubi sunt gaudia, ibi sint et corda*. “Why then art thou sad, O my soul, and why disquietest thou me? Hope thou in God; for I will still praise Him Who is the salvation of my countenance and my God ” (Ps. xlii. 6).

### THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The great day of the coming of the Christ advances, and Holy Church cannot contain her joy, which ever flows at the thought of her Beloved. “The Lord is already nigh, come let us adore Him,” is the cry with which she now invites us to the divine service; and she borrows Isaias’s burning words to express the happiness in store for her on the day when “the Orient from on high” (St. Luke i. 78) shall visit her. “In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Juda. Sion is a city of our strength, of our Saviour. We have a strong city. There shall be appointed for walls and a bulwark . . . Open ye thy gates, and let the righteous nation which keepeth the truth enter in. The old error departs, Thou shalt keep peace, for in Thee have we hoped. Thou hast hoped in the Lord for everlasting ages, in the Lord, the strong God, for ever” (*Lec. in I. Noct.*) The joy of the Holy Ghost and the peace of God which surpasseth understanding will come with the Christ when He comes



to the righteous in all the unspeakable sweetness of the Babe of Bethlehem ; when He visits us in His grace, and when He comes to make all things new as the Sovereign Judge. The thought of all this makes Holy Church for this day lessen her penitential preparation ; and in sign thereof she clothes her ministers in their symbolical garb of joy of rose colour, and bids the organ add its voice to the joyful songs of the liturgy. She calls all her children, under the mystic name of Jerusalem, " to joy with a great joy, for there comes to us a Saviour, Alleluia (2 *Ant. ad Laud.*)" ; for as we have said joy is always the companion of holy hope.

The sentiments of Holy Church are fully expressed in the Introit (Phil. iv.) : " Rejoice in the Lord alway ; again I say, rejoice. Let your modesty be known to all men, for the Lord is nigh. Be you nothing solicitous, but in all prayerfulness let your petitions be made known to God." *Ps.* " Thou hast blessed, O Lord, Thy land, and hath turned away the bondage of Jacob." Joy in the Holy Ghost (cf. Rom. iv. 17) is other than the world's joy ; it is a remembrance that God is our Father ; it is the happy sunshine of the thought that God loves us, and would have us love Him in return ; it is a " joy which no man can take from us " (cf. John xvi. 22), for it is a heavenly gift, and a joy which sorrow cannot dim. As we have said, there is no true service of God where there is gloom. Gloom is of the devil, joy of God. Hence we have an easy way of knowing whether we are led by the Spirit of God ; and that is, whether we are " joyful in the Lord." " Where the Spirit is, there is liberty " (2 Cor. iii. 17) ; and one of the fruits of the Spirit is joy (cf. Gal. v. 22) ; and, as the Psalmist says, " In Thy presence is the fulness of joy " (Ps. xv. 11). This joy differs from earthly joy, not only in its source, but also in its outer manifestation ; for it is always joined with holy modesty or moderation, as we have no time to waste on external things, for the Lord is so near. Hence we are to use the things of this world as though we used them not ; " as free, and not using our liberty as a cloak for maliciousness, but as servants of God " (1 Peter ii. 16). This shows us that the secret spring of spiritual joy is mortification, the

restraint we put on ourselves by the virtue of modesty. Who is so joyous as the mortified man? Look at the bright, happy St. Philip, brimful of cheerfulness and joy, and remember his heroic life of mortification. Well, this joy in the thought of the boundless love of God, Who is coming, and even now is nigh at our doors, will keep our heart free from the sordid cares of life: “He knoweth that we have need of all these things” (St. Matt. vi. 32). Still He desires that we let Him know our wants by prayer, and He has Himself deigned to teach us, in the *Lord’s Prayer*, how to ask, “with all modesty,” for what is necessary. “The old error” of solicitude departs from us, and we shall be in perfect joy, for we trust in Him (cf. *Lect. I. Noct.*). Our soul is that “land” which the Lord loves, and upon which He has showered His choicest blessings, by calling us to be His lot and inheritance. From the captivity of the world He has rescued us, and has given us liberty as sons of God. What joy, then, should not be ours! *Dominus pars hereditatis mee et calicis mei. Tu es qui restitues hereditatem meam mihi* (Ps. xv. 5), the joy of sons already reigning in the kingdom with their Father Who has turned away the bondage of Jacob. Our life as sacrificers of the spotless Lamb, as priests and victims, should be made known to the whole world, so that men might see in us that the Lord is very nigh; for we should walk in the presence of God, and be perfect (cf. Gen. xvii. 1). We should show to the world that a priest’s heart is the *mons Dei, mons pinguis, mons coagulatus; mons in quo beneplacitum est Deo habitare* (Ps. lxxvii.).

The Collect asks that our joy in the coming of the Christ may be made full by having the darkness of our heart dispelled by the dawning of the Sun of Justice. That sweet harbinger of the day of the Lord, the Immaculate Conception, has already shed its fair rays upon our heart, and in the shining of that beauteous star, joy and hope have come to us, and it has been the image of the better things to come (cf. Heb. vii. 19). Sin brings darkness, and darkness puts out the light of joy; but “joy cometh with the morning” (Ps. xxix. 5); and Jesus tells us that He will give us, if we

keep His words to the end, "the Morning Star" to be our very own (Apoc. ii. 28).

In the Epistle we have the words of the Introit repeated. There is a special reason for this call to modesty, or mortification, for the Ember-days are at hand; and, as St. Leo says (cf. *Lect. II. Noct.*), it is fitting that we should, after the gathering in of God's abundant gifts, offer to Him the libation of our moderation in their use. "What is more efficacious than fasting? For by its observance we draw near to God, and by resisting the devil we overcome the blandishments of vice. Fasting has always been the food of virtue; for out of abstinence come chaste thoughts, right desires, and wholesome counsels; and by voluntary afflictions the flesh dies to its lusts, and the spirit is renewed in virtue." Let us, therefore, in the joy of the Lord, enter on the fast, and remember that the Lord is near, and becomes nearer still by the practice of mortification. Then will the peace of God keep our intelligence and will in perfect harmony with "that mind which was in Jesus the Christ" (Phil. ii. 5); and that mind becomes ours if we bear in our bodies "the dying of Jesus;" for then He manifests His life in us (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10).

The same sweet strain of joy goes on in the Gradual (Ps. lxxix.), and the yearning for the coming grows more and more intense, and we cannot help thinking of the expectation of our dearest Mother. He who is nigh is the Almighty God, whose throne is above the cherubim; and His coming is a work of great power. His loving care for His chosen ones, for "the sheep of His pasture" (Ps. lxxviii. 13), is the cause of His descent from heaven, "for us men and for our salvation." Praise to His goodness and mercy, which has followed us all the days of our life (cf. Ps. xxii. 6)! The thought of what He is makes us redouble our prayers, that He would come and save us. The joy we have in being His, adds insistence to our prayer, and our very hope makes us impatient for the promised coming. Oh, when shall we see the King in all His beauty, and the land that is far off? Come, Lord, and show forth Thy power, and save us, for we need Thee so much, and our heart can find no rest but in

Thee. And do Thou, O Blissful Mother, by the longings of thine own expectation, help us during the long, weary time of waiting.

“ . . . Thy waiting now is o’er ;  
Thou hast seen Him, Blessed Mother,  
And dost see Him evermore.

Oh, His human face and features !  
They are passing fair to see ;  
Thou behold’st them every moment,  
Mother, show them now to me.”

In the Gospel (St. John i.) we have the account of the mission sent by the priests and levites to the holy Precursor ; and, reading it, we seem to hear a voice from our brethren calling on us to give an answer, and tell them who and what we are. Alas ! to our shame we must confess, and not deny, we are not the Christ ; and yet, by virtue of our ordination, we ought to be so : *Sacerdos alter Christus*. We are not Elias, in his mortified life and bold rebuke of sin ; and yet, as ambassadors for Christ and His representatives, we ought to be like him. Neither are we the great Teacher, save in words ; and yet we are sent expressly to teach, and to bring the Christ home to the multitude, who are perishing from hunger in the desert. But by His grace, so freely given to us in the grand Sacrament of Orders, we will be, at least, the voice of one crying, by word and example, out to souls who are in the desert of the world, “ Prepare ye the way of the Lord : ” cast off sorrow of sin, and “ be joyful, for the Lord is nigh.” A secret virtue should go forth from us if we are true to our priesthood, and affect, they know not how, all with whom we come in contact. But how often is the contrary the case. We stand in their midst, clothed in the very priesthood, and representing the person of the Christ ; and yet, by our worldly behaviour and conversation, we hinder men from knowing what we are, and the grace of our presence is wasted. But, oh ! the joy to a true priest, who knows Him who is ever with Him, although the world may not heed His presence. What humility is his who knows how all unworthy he is of this Divine Companion, the latchet of Whose shoes he is not fit to loose ! And yet this joy in the



Lord is for us all, “did we but know the gift of God” (cf. St. John iv. 10).

The Offertory (Ps. lxxxiv.) carries on the meditation on joy we found in the Introit, and now of all times is it fitting that we should be glad in the Lord when we are at the altar of Him “Who maketh glad our youth” (Ps. xlii.). But, with warning words to chasten our joy, Holy Church reminds us that we are sinners; and so deepens our feelings with the remembrance that we have been redeemed by and owe all to that Precious Blood we are going to offer in sacrifice. The Secret prays that the Victim of our devotion may secure for us the joy to be found in the salvation our Lord so wonderfully works in us by His threefold coming, in which He begins, carries on, and completes the work of our sanctification.

In the Communion (Is. xxxv.) we have words full of hopeful joy which will help us on for the rest of the time of Advent. Flesh and blood are always fainthearted, and are always calling upon us to put down our burdens and rest awhile. On the way to meet the coming Saviour there can be no resting, no halting; we must not cease to prepare the way for His sacred feet. So the words of the royal prophet come to us straight from the Sacred Heart Which is now beating beneath ours: “Say ye, be ye comforted O ye fainthearted, and fear not: Lo! our God will come and will save us.” As a pledge of what He will do in “the great day of His coming,” He has already come in the adorable sacrament of His love, and is even now with us. So, full of the joy and courage He gives our heart in this hour, we will put away all fearsomeness and weariness, for “our God *will* save us.”

The Post-Communion reminds us that the Blessed Sacrament is the best of all preparations for meeting God on that eternal feast-day when He will come to raise up those who have eaten His Body and drunk His Blood. May we make of each day's Mass a preparation for the morrow's; and this we will do if we lead lives of joy in the Lord and show by our unworldly and mortified lives that the Lord has been with us in the morning, and will be near us again when the next day breaks.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

This is the last Sunday of the preparation, and Holy Church begins to count the hours till the mysteries of the coming is revealed. And in her care for us, her priests, she knows of no stronger motive to stir up our devotion and hope than the thought of our holy vocation. The ordinations engrossed her attention yesterday, and she has borne many new Christs to her God, and they will to-day stand before the altar for the first time and exercise their sublime ministry. She would have us, who have already been bearing the burden and heat of the day, refresh our soul by thinking upon the marvellous outpouring of grace and riches we have received through our priestly office, and let it make our heart glow with holy love and gratitude for Him Who is already nigh. The passage from the prophet, who has been instructing us all during Advent at our matins, is the picture of a priestly soul fresh from the impression of the heavenly character. If it is so fair then in the sight of God and His holy angels, how much fairer and more beautiful still ought it not to be after so many years of intimate union with our dearest Lord? If Moses after a short sojourn on the mount had to veil his face because of the brightness of its shining, (and yet he had only been in converse with an angel), how much more should our souls, at least, shine after ten, twenty, thirty, or more years of standing face to face, as each morning comes round, with Jesus the Almighty God, holding Him in our trembling hands, and receiving Him into our poor wretched heart? Listen then to the prophet Isaias: “The wilderness and the trackless place shall rejoice, and the desert shall be glad and shall bloom as the lily. Budding it shall put forth its bud, and with joy and song of praise shall rejoice. The glory of Libanon shall be given to it, the beauty of Carmel and Saron. They shall see the glory of the Lord and the beauty of our God . . . Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be loosened . . . For water has gushed forth in the wilderness, and torrents in the solitary places” (xxxv.). Such is the effect the coming of the Christ

has on the soul in ordination. Oh ! what will His coming be like in that latter day when He will call us to the land of the living.

The Introit speaks of the Advent as the falling of dew upon thirsty ground: “ Drop down dew, O ye heavens, and let the clouds rain down the Just One ; let the earth open and bud forth the Saviour. (Ps.) The heavens are telling the glory of God, and the firmament declare the work of His hands.” By the imposition of the bishop’s hands, the dew of the Holy Ghost descended upon us, and as the silent rain the Just One came down upon us, and stamped us with the mark of His own unspeakable priesthood, making us one with Himself. The cold arid earth of our heart, under the genial warmth of the sacramental grace of Orders, awoke and budded forth the Saviour ; and we came from the ordination a new man with our real life hidden with Christ in God (*ut supra*) ; for we lived no longer our old life, but a Christ-like life for the salvation of the world. We came back marked with the mark of sacrifice, priests and victims ; no longer master of ourself, for we had given ourself to Him to be His instruments in adoring the Eternal Majesty. Can heaven or earth with all their glories tell of aught like the beauty of a priestly soul with all the fragrance of the sacred unction still clinging to it ? Brighter than the fairest scene of earth, more brilliant than the stars, moon, or sun, in his soul in the eyes of the wondering angels for he has put on the Lord Jesus” (Rom. xiii. 14), and shines with the splendour of the Eternal Priesthood. We as good servants, then, must not bury the talent given to us ; but we must trade with the same against the day of the coming of the Master, and “ by performing the priestly office,” prepare in the best possible way for the day of reckoning.

In the Collect we earnestly pray God once more to stir up His might, and come and succour us, that His grace may help us to fulfil the work entrusted to us in our priesthood. Our sins bar the designs of His mercy, working towards us through our great sacrament of Orders ; and it needs the putting forth of His great might to stir up our heart to regain the old fervour.

In the Epistle (1 Cor. iv. 1), the dignity of the priestly office is set before both priest and people ; that the one should esteem and venerate the glory with which God has clothed the other. We are ministers of Christ and dispensers of God's mysteries ; sacrificers, and the channels of His mercy to men. Being His stewards our first care must be to be faithful and diligent in what is given to our charge. We must put God first in everything, and both act and live according to His will, not minding what men may think. Being His ambassadors, we must behave ourselves as such ; and then God will be jealous for us, and we need not fear the judgments of men. He alone readeth the heart, and He is the One Whom we have to seek to please. None other will be our judge, and from Him we will not be able to hide our unfaithfulness, for He makes clear the hidden things of darkness and the evil plottings of hearts. But hoping in Him and living as become priests, we need not fear ; for He is a righteous Judge, and gives to all the praise and rewards that are deserved.

Lest the thought of the dread responsibility of our vocation should frighten us, the Gradual (Ps. cxliv.) tells us that God is nigh to all who choose to call upon Him, and who trustingly rely upon His word that “He will come to save us” (*ut supra*). Therefore as He so graciously gives us such abundance of means to carry out what He has laid upon us, we will praise Him with our whole being, and give ourselves up unreservedly to His service. So, in hope and joy, journeying on, we sigh after His day, and pray Him to come and tarry not ; to loosen His chosen people from the bonds of sin which make them unworthy to abide in the day of His coming, and to stand when He appeareth (cf. Mal. iii. 2).

Our surest means of so doing is found in the Gospel (St. Luke iii.), and is shown to us in the example of the holy Baptist who preaches to us “penance for the remission of sins.” There it is again ! the old story which needs so much repetition, for we are always forgetting it, and our fallen nature would be only too pleased were we to forget it altogether. Penance, mortification, the life of a victim ! All this is meant by the priesthood of the crucified Christ,



in which we are privileged to share. We are called upon to sacrifice for the living and the dead ; we have to make intercession for the people, and must do penance not only for our sins, but for the sins of those committed to our care. In the words of Thomas à Kempis, the priest "weareth the cross before him, that he may bewail his own sins, and behind him, that he may through compassion lament the sins of others, and know that he is placed, as it were, a mediator betwixt God and the sinner. Neither ought he to cease from prayer and the holy oblation till he be favoured with the grace and mercy he imploreth." (Lib. iv., cap. 5.) By means of our ministry and godly life, all flesh shall see the salvation of God ; for the priesthood is the "light of the world," and the great means of preparation for the coming of the Lord. Without it how shall the sinner find a means of pardon ? how make atonement for his sins ? how pay the homage of a true and perfect worship to his Maker ? How shall the mountains and hills of pride and sensuality be brought low, and the crooked ways be made straight, and the rough places plain, save by the all-sufficing sacrifice of Jesus the Christ in the Mass ? Hence, as faithful priests, we must be living preachers and practisers of the baptism of penance for the remission of sin, and preach to a world sunk in iniquity the Gospel of "the Christ and Him Crucified," (*ut supra*).

In the Offertory, the sweet thought of Mary is well put before us ; for are we not, as it were, other Marys, fulfilling to the Host the duties she performed to the Babe ? Does not our Divine Lord (oh ! wonder) owe His sacramental existence to our co-operation ? Do we not give Him a new birth by the act of our will at the moment of consecration ? Is not the Lord with us in a most special way when, clothed in the eternal priesthood of Jesus, we say in His own very Person the awful words of Consecration ? Are we not, too, blessed above all others in the high dignity we are called to, and in the magnificent graces with which Holy Orders deluges our soul ? Mary will teach us how to fulfil our duties to her Son, and will, now that we are going to perform them, cast round us the mantle of her protecting love, that

we may not fear at His coming, but love the day thereof. The Secret prays these dispositions of devotion may be ours, so that we may worthily offer the Divine Sacrifice and fulfil our priesthood.

The Communion (Is. vii.) continues the thought of our likeness to our ever-dear and Blessed Lady ; and oh ! how true are the words now, that Jesus is with us ; and how deep the mystery. To say Mass, and “produce ” Jesus on the altar worthily, we must be virgins, pure and without sin ; for He delights to feed among the lilies (cf. Cant. vi. 3). When He is in our heart, what name can we give Him but the sweet name of “Emanuel, which is, God with us” ? Indeed God is with us : His Sacred Body and Blood united with our body, as long as the Sacred Species remain : His adorable soul united with ours for ever, unless we shamefully break the union by wilful mortal sin. “He that eateth Me, the same liveth by Me” (St. John vi. 57) ; and as Jesus lived during nine months in Mary’s most pure womb with a oneness of life with her, so does He live with us, not for nine months only, but for ever, if we will but allow Him ! Truly, “no other nation hath its gods so near to them as our God is near to us” (cf. Deut. iv. 7) ; Emanuel ! God with us, to help us to prepare for His coming !

In this wondrous union our soul ought to grow day by day in virtue, the rough places which offend Him, and hinder Him from taking full possession of our soul, ought to be made plain, and our crooked will, ever going off from our true end, ought to be made straight, and never diverge from His sweet will ! That we may get these benefits from our priestly office, which we have just fulfilled, is the tenour of the Post-Communion.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

*(To be continued.)*

## THE BIRTHPLACE OF ST. PATRICK.

## I. ST. PATRICK WAS A NATIVE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

**M**UIRCHU MACCU MACTHENI, the earliest and best biographer of St. Patrick, asserts that the Apostle of Ireland was both by race and birth a Briton. "Patrick, also called Sochet, a Briton by nation, was born in Britain."<sup>1</sup> When St. Patrick fled from slavery in Ireland, he abode with his kinsfolk in Britain, and they "earnestly besought him never more to leave them after the many sufferings which he had undergone."<sup>2</sup> But he nevertheless set forth a few years later to visit the Apostolic See, and having sailed across the southern British Sea, he wended his way over the high hills of Gaul, to Auxerre.<sup>3</sup> His early home therefore was in Great Britain, and not in Armoric Gaul. Great Britain was his fatherland, for when St. Patrick wrote his *Confession*, in his old age, amidst his many weary wanderings in Ireland, he yearned, as he tells us, to revisit once more his kindred in Britain, and the servants of God in Gaul.

"Whence it comes  
Should I now care to leave them, going forth  
It may be into Britain, sure 'twere sweet  
To see one's country and one's kin again,<sup>4</sup>  
Or further yet proceeding even to Gaul  
To see the brethren, and the faces see  
Of my Lord's saints, God knows, I were right glad,  
But by the Spirit am bound, and He declares  
I were God's recreant did I leave them so."<sup>5</sup>

## II. ST. PATRICK WAS NOT BORN IN SCOTLAND.

Most modern writers hold that St. Patrick was born on the banks of the Clyde in Scotland, and they give these reasons for that opinion—The *Leabhar Breac*, the *Tripartite*,

<sup>1</sup> *Documenta de S. Patricio*; Edidit Rev. E. Hogan, S.J., page 21. Muirchu Maccu Machtheni was a disciple of Aedh, Bishop of Sleibhte, who died in the year 698.

<sup>2</sup> The *Confession* of St. Patrick.

<sup>3</sup> *Documenta*, page 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Quasi ad patriam et parentes*.

<sup>5</sup> The *Confession*; *Remains of St. Patrick*, by Sir S. Ferguson.

and the *Book of Lismore* identify Nemthor the birthplace of St. Patrick as Ailcluade; the *Liber Hymnorum* states that Ailcluade was a city of northern Britain, and the *Vita quarta* of Colgan declares that it was situated in the plain of Strathclyde.

The *Breviary of Aberdeen* asserts that St. Patrick was born at Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, and an ancient and unvarying tradition declares that Dumbarton was his birthplace. According to Probus and some ancient documents, he was a native of Bannave in the plain of Tabern.<sup>1</sup>

These authorities, however, go back no further than the tenth century, and most of them are of later date, and their statements, if they be true, only prove that St. Patrick was born at Alcluade in northern Britain. The conclusion that the Apostle of Ireland was born on the banks of the river Clyde in Scotland, indeed is drawn from these premises by many Irish writers; but Scotland was called Alba<sup>2</sup> when these ancient documents were written, and St. Patrick may have been born in the valley of the Clyde (Clwyd) in northern Wales, which then was called northern Britain.

The *Breviary of Aberdeen* was not published before the year 1509, and is not free from historical errors,<sup>3</sup> and no proof has yet been given of the existence of an ancient and constant tradition that St. Patrick was a native of Scotland. Neither Fiac in the sixth century, nor Tirechan nor Muirchu in the seventh century, hands it down to us: not one of the seven ancient Lives published by Colgan alludes to it; Probus, writing in the eleventh century, and Jocelyn, writing in the thirteenth century, are silent with regard to it; and the *Breviary of Armagh* and the *Book of Lismore* make no mention of it. Even were there such a tradition, it would not make us certain; for, as Cardinal Newman writes:<sup>4</sup> "Tradition is really a ground in reason, an argument for believing to a certain point; but then we do not commonly think it right and safe on the score of mere vague testimony

<sup>1</sup> *Dublin Review*, April, 1880

<sup>2</sup> *MSS. Materials*, O'Curry.

<sup>3</sup> *I. E. RECORD*, 1889, page 130.

<sup>4</sup> *Lectures on Catholicism in England*.



to keep our eyes and ears so very close to every other means of proof. Tradition then being information not authenticated, but immemorial, is a *prima facie* evidence of the facts which it witnesses. It is sufficient to make us take a thing for granted in default of real proof; it is sufficient for our having an opinion about it: it is sufficient often to make us feel it to be safest to act in a certain way under circumstances; it is not sufficient in reason to make us sure, much less to make us angry with those who take a different view of the matter. It is not sufficient to warrant us to dispense with proof the other way if it be offered to us."

There are indisputable facts that go far to prove that Scotland was not the fatherland of St. Patrick. The country north and south of the river Clyde, at the time when he was born, was often the battle-field between the Roman soldiers and the wild inhabitants of Caledonia; and sometimes the storm of war swept further south, and the terror-stricken Christians fled for shelter beyond the wall of Adrian, between the Solway and the Tyne. There were a city and a senate, priests, and a numerous Christian community where St. Patrick had his home, and where he was taken captive; and thither he returned after his bondage in Ireland, and was welcomed by his kinsfolk. He went there once again when he had become a bishop, and was setting out to preach the Gospel to the Irish; and in his old age, when the century was coming to an end, he yearned to revisit once more his fatherland and his friends—*patriam et parentes*.

Towards the middle of the fourth century there was a solitary Roman garrison, entrenched upon a lofty rock which overhung the broad river whose waters separated the province of Valentia from the inaccessible mountain fastnesses of the warlike Caledonians. It was an outpost at the extremity of the Empire; and it was the last of the line of forts along the rampart of intermingled earth and stone, stretching from sea to sea, which was erected by the Roman emperors as a barrier against the wild and savage nations of the North. The Roman fortress was often beleaguered by the heathen Picts; and, in the year 368, Picts and Scots,

and warlike Attacots, drove the Roman soldiers in headlong flight southwards, and the fair Roman province was laid waste by the pitiless storm of war. The Emperor Theodosius won back the land as far as the wall of Agricola; but his conquest was not lasting, for soon the hardy Highland Caledonians poured forth from their mountain fastnesses; and, notwithstanding a defeat in battle, in the year 399, by the soldiers sent from Rome by Stilicho, overspread the whole country between the Solway and the Clyde. The Roman fortress was forsaken, and the British Christians, hitherto sheltered by the Roman legions, took refuge among their fellow-countrymen in Northern Britain.<sup>1</sup>

“The Romans ceased to rule in Britain almost four hundred and seventy years after Caius Julius Cæsar invaded the island (A.D. 410). They dwelt within the rampart made by Severus across the island to the south,<sup>2</sup> as the cities, churches, bridges, and paved roads made therein witness until this day; but they had a right of dominion over the further parts of Britain, as well as over the islands beyond Britain. The southern part of Britain, then, being deprived of armed soldiers and of its active youth, was wholly exposed to rapine; and they suffered for many years from two very savage foreign nations—the Scots from the West, and the Picts from the North. On account of the irruption of these nations, the Britons sent messengers to Rome praying for help. An armed legion was sent at once, which slew a multitude of the enemies, drove the rest out of the territory of their allies, and advised them to build a wall, between the two seas, across the island; and thus they returned home in great triumph. The islanders making the wall, not of stone, but with sods of earth, between the two inlets of the sea, it was useless.<sup>3</sup> And the former foes, seeing that the Roman soldiers had gone away, immediately coming by sea, broke into the borders, trampled and overran all places, and bore down all before them, like men mowing ripe corn (A.D. 416). Hereupon messengers were sent to Rome begging succour. A legion was, therefore, sent again; and, coming unexpectedly in autumn, made great slaughter of the enemy. Then the Romans declared to the Britons that they could not in future undertake such troublesome expeditions for their sake, advising them rather to handle their weapons like men; and, thinking it might be some help to their allies, they

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*: Freeman.

<sup>2</sup> Between the Tyne and Solway Firth.

<sup>3</sup> Between the Clyde and the Firth of Forth.

built a strong wall of stone, in a straight line, from sea to sea, near the ditch of Severus.<sup>1</sup> They also built towers southwards, at certain distances, where their ships were; and so took leave of their friends, never to return again. After their departure, the Scots and Picts, understanding that they had declared that they would come no more, speedily returned, and took possession of all the northern and farthest part of the island, as far as the wall. At last the Britons, forsaking their towns and wall, fled, and were dispersed. The enemy pursued, and the slaughter was greater than on any former occasion; for the wretched natives were torn in pieces by their foes.”<sup>2</sup>

The pagan and apostate Picts and Scots remained masters of the former Roman province of Valentia until the year 573, when the British king, Rhydderch Hael, marching with a powerful army from Wales, gained a great victory over them at Adderyd, and founded the kingdom of Strathclyde, and made Alcluade, situate on the site of the ancient Roman fortress, the capital of his new dominion.

It is most unlikely that the home of St. Patrick was in such a savage land, or that he could have in after times dwelt peacefully there amid his former friends and kindred.

“I knew not the true God; and led away  
 Into captivity, *with thousands more*,  
 Was brought to Ireland, fate too well deserved;  
 For *we* from God had far withdrawn ourselves.  
 We kept not His commandments: *our priests*  
 Who urged salvation on us, we heeded not.”<sup>3</sup>

“After a few years I was again in Britain with my kinsfolk, who welcomed me as a son.”<sup>4</sup> “And again, after a few years, he dwelt peacefully as before in his *native land* amongst his kindred, who received him as a son.”<sup>5</sup> “In the xxiii. year of his age, he sailed to Britain, and he was xxx. years of age and he set out to visit the Apostolic Sec.”<sup>6</sup>

St. Patrick left Gaul for Ireland, about the year 432, and having embarked on board the ship awaiting him, swiftly

<sup>1</sup> Between the Tyne and Solway Firth.

<sup>2</sup> *Eccles. History*, V. Bede, l. i., ch. 12, 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Confession of St. Patrick*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Muirchu Maccu Mactheni; *Documenta*, page 23.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

sped to the coast of Britain, and there he met once more the seniors and the friends of his early days, and despite their most earnest entreaties he pursued his journey to the Irish shore.

“ And many were the gifts  
They offered me with *yearning and with tears* ;  
And certain of my seniors too made known  
Their disapproval ; but, with the help of God,  
In no way did I yield them my consent ;  
Not mine the grace, but God it was in me,  
Who conquered through me and withstood them all,  
That I might come to preach His Gospel here  
To the Hibernian people.” <sup>1</sup>

It can hardly be that this homelike Christian life should have been amid a land wasted by fire and sword, or that the Christian community where he had spent his youth should have continued to exist among their fierce and lawless foes, the pagan Picts, who dwelt beyond the Roman wall between the Solway and the Tyne.

When St. Patrick came back as bishop to Britain, he dwelt a short while with his kinsfolk, and then set sail for Ireland. He landed first upon the coast of Wicklow, and then, bethinking himself of the duty of paying his ransom to his former master Miluic, before setting free the souls of the Irish people from the slavery of Satan, he sailed northwards along the eastern coast of Ireland until he came to Strangford Lough, where he disembarked.<sup>2</sup> Who then can doubt that his spiritual fathers and the beloved friends of his youth dwelt not in Alba, but in Britain, and that there his former home had been?

### III. ST. PATRICK WAS A NATIVE OF NORTH WALES.

Many ancient writers assert that St. Patrick was born at Ailcluaith<sup>3</sup> in the valley of the Clwyd. This Rock-of-Clwyd was situated upon the bank of the river Clwyd in the vale of Clwyd, near the present town of Rhyl;<sup>4</sup> and two hundred

<sup>1</sup> *Confession of St. Patrick.*

<sup>2</sup> Muirchu : *Documenta*, page 29.

<sup>3</sup> It is written Alcluade, Ailcluath, and Alcluid.

<sup>4</sup> *Dublin Review*, 1887, vol ii., page 393 : Camden's *Britannia*, page 819.



years after the birth of St. Patrick, the British King Rhydderch Hael, having conquered southern Scotland, gave that name to the city, which he built upon the shore of the northern Clyde.<sup>1</sup> But Colgan held that this northern city of the Britons was called Arclyde (Airdclwyd).

That northern Wales was the birthplace of St. Patrick, appears certain from the fact that his father Calphurnus was a citizen of the great Brito-Roman city of Caer-Legion, upon the river Dee. Calphurnus was a senator, and therefore he was a citizen of a Roman colonial city.

“I was born noble : my father a senator ;  
That privilege of birth I have exchanged ;  
I blush not for it, and I grudge it not,  
For benefit of others.”<sup>2</sup>

Each colonial city had a senate in imitation of the Roman Senate, and as at Rome, so in each Roman colonial city the popular assembly at first had sovereign power choosing magistrates and making laws, but that power was transferred by Tiberius to the Senate, and it thus acquired, under the name of *Ordo Decurionum*, full authority in the city.<sup>3</sup> As the Roman Senate was composed of those who had held high office in the State, or had gained victories on the battle-field, so likewise the colonial senates comprised the more wealthy landowners of the neighbouring country.<sup>4</sup> Constantine separated military and civil functions, and thenceforth noble senators (*Decuriones*), like Calphurnus, had to serve the empire as magistrates of their native city.<sup>5</sup> The father of St. Patrick, therefore, was a citizen of a Brito-Roman colonial city, and at the time when St. Patrick was born, towards the close of the fourth century, there was no such city north of the Roman wall, but there were many such cities throughout the provinces of Britain. Muirchu Maccu Mactheni asserts that St. Patrick “was born in Britain, the son of Cualfarnus, who was in the vicus of

<sup>1</sup> *Celtic Scotland*, Skene.

<sup>2</sup> *Letter to the Soldiers of Coroticus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antig.*, Smith.

<sup>4</sup> *Constantini magni decreta*, Migne, vol. viii.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

Bannavem thabur indecha, not far from our sea,"<sup>1</sup> and many ancient Irish writers make the same assertion.<sup>2</sup> The only Brito-Roman city situated near the Irish Sea was the city of Caer-Legion, which is now called Chester,<sup>3</sup> for the Irish Sea (Oceanum Hibernicum) lay between the north of Ireland and the north of Britain, whereas the sea between southern Ireland and southern Britain was called the Vergivium Sea (Oceanus Vergivius), or the Sea of Icht.

The Castrum of Caer-Legion was occupied since the time of the Emperor Galba, by the twentieth Roman Legion called Victorius. It was a splendid city abounding with wealth, and famous for its commerce. "It was," as the monk Lucian writes, "excellently situated; and being on the west of Britain, it was most suited to guard the frontier of the Empire." "When I behold," writes Roger, of Chester, the foundations of the buildings up and down the streets, it seems the effect of Roman strength, and the work of giants, rather than of British industry." This "noble city"<sup>4</sup>—one of the loveliest gems of "the most wealthy island, the British Isle, which is both the first and the greatest of all"<sup>5</sup>—was destroyed by the Saxon King Aethelfrith, in the year 613; but portions of its massive Roman walls still remain as witnesses of its former greatness.<sup>6</sup>

Ancient Irish writers declare that St. Patrick was born at Aileluid, in the valley of the Clwyd; but the noble Senator Calphurnus, doubtless, was a landowner, like the other magistrates and civil rulers of the city;<sup>7</sup> and as we know, from the *Confession*, he possessed a country villa, and there he dwelt amid his broad acres in some pleasant spot by the seashore, or on some sunlit hillside overlooking the well-tilled lowland, where his many British serfs toiled peacefully beneath the shelter of the neighbouring Roman

<sup>1</sup> *Documenta*, page 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Dublin Review*, April, 1887.

<sup>3</sup> "Castria de Castris nomen quasi Castria sumpsit."

<sup>4</sup> *Giraldus Camb.*, Itin.

<sup>5</sup> Constantius, *Vita St. Germani*.

<sup>6</sup> It was sometimes called Caer-Legion Vaur (Great) by the British.

<sup>7</sup> *Constantini magni decreta*, Migne, vol. viii.

<sup>8</sup> The Britons at Caer-Legion were of the Cornavii tribe. Vide *Sidorii Apoll.*, l. ii., Ep. 2. Carmina Migne, l. viii., p. 723.

Castrum. "In Britain, as in Italy or Gaul, the population probably declined as the estates of the landed proprietors grew large, and the tillers of the soil gradually became serfs whose cabins clustered around the luxurious villas of their lords."<sup>1</sup> "The Romans, and the Britons who had made themselves Romans, must have pretty well occupied the whole land, as we find not only remains of towns in all parts of the country, but also of villas or country seats. The towns were then almost everything. The men, whom we should now call noblemen, or rich gentlemen, though they had houses in the country, where they spent part of their time, were citizens of some town, and filled offices there." The stately mansions of the wealthy citizens of Caer-Legion were thus scattered over the fertile plain between the city and the Irish Sea, and the gilded roofs of their marble palaces gleamed brightly amidst the dark green woods along the rich valley of the Clwyd. St. Patrick, in the freshness of his youth, was torn from his happy home in this peaceful valley by savage heathen sea-rovers, and, with his springtime overcast, and the flowers of hope blighted, was sold as a slave in a foreign land, together with many thousands of his fellow-Christians.<sup>2</sup> Thenceforth no sound was heard amid the leafy glades and winding pathways of the woodland save the sweet music and the cheerful voices of countless happy birds.

The vale of Clwyd was many miles from the Brito-Roman city, but the well-trained steeds of these wealthy men, bore them swiftly to and fro upon the splendid Roman road. "You wonder," writes the younger Pliny, "why my Laurentinum—or, if you prefer, Laurens—pleases me so much. You will cease to wonder when you shall have learned the attractions of the villa, the convenience of the place, and the stretch of seashore. It is seventeen miles from the city, so that after finishing one's business one can reach it, and still have the whole day before one."<sup>4</sup> St. Patrick, doubtless, was

<sup>1</sup> *History of English People*, Green.

<sup>2</sup> *English Hist.*, Freeman.

<sup>3</sup> "Villam enim prope habuit ubi ego in capturam dedi, Annorum eram tunc fere sedecim," *Confessio*.

<sup>4</sup> *Epist.*, l. ii., 19.

born, either at the country villa of his father, in the vale of Clwyd, or at his city house in Caer-Legion.

The Castrum of Caer-Legion was also called Divana by the Romans, for the river that flowed beside it to the sea was called Dyfr-dwy by the native Britons; and the city built upon its banks received the river's name, and was called Deva or Divina.<sup>1</sup> Divana (Dyfr-dwy) means "heavenly river."<sup>2</sup> "Divana Celtarum lingua fons addite Divis."<sup>3</sup> Fiac, the earliest writer extant, who makes mention of St. Patrick, states that Nemthur was his birthplace. "Patrick was born at Nemthur, as histories relate,"<sup>4</sup> and Nemthur, like Divana and Dyfr-dwy, means "heavenly river."<sup>5</sup> St. Patrick, in his *Confession*, writes:—"I had for father, Calpornus, who was in the vicus Bannavem Taburnie, for he had a villa hard by where I was taken captive;" and Muirchu Maccu Maetheni writes:—"Patrick, born of Cualfarnus, who was in the vicus Bannavem thabur indecha - which vicus we have always and for certain found to be Ventre."<sup>5</sup> Many a hard-fought war has been waged around these ancient Irish words, but they are but another form of Fiac's Nemthur; and thus these archaic terms bear out the historical arguments that go so far to prove that Northern Wales was the native place of the great Apostle of the Irish race.

ALBERT BARRY, C.S.S.R.

<sup>1</sup> A Roman coin was found at Chester with the inscription, "Col : Divana Leg : xx. Victrix." Vide Camden's *Britannia*, page 671.

<sup>2</sup> *Celtic Britain*, Rhys.

<sup>3</sup> Ausonius.

<sup>4</sup> *Metrical Life of St. Patrick*: sixth century.

<sup>5</sup> "Nem" means "heavenly," and "thur" (dur) or "thabur" in old Irish means "a river," *v.g.*, "Thabur Seaghsa;" *i.e.*, the river Boyne (O'Reilly). Dur (Thur in Irish) was the Celtic word for "river," both in Britain and in Gaul, *e.g.*, Derwent (*i.e.*, the gently flowing river), and Durantia "Tabur-nie" of the *Confession* also means "heavenly river," "nie" being a phonetic, though faulty, rendering of "nem;" and "Indecha," according to some writers, has a somewhat similar meaning. "Ventre," *i.e.*, Fiontraigh (white strand or inlet), *e.g.*, Ventry Harbour, in co. Kerry, and Ballynavennoorage, near Mount Brandon; but Rev. S. Malone reads it Nentre, *i.e.*, Nen-dwyr (heavenly river), vide *Dublin Review*, 1886, p. 330. "Vicus" probably means a ward; for Roman Colonial towns, like Rome itself, were divided into wards. The words, then, of the *Confession* and of Muirchu may be translated: "Calpharnus who was in the ward, Whitehaven (or river-mouth) of the heavenly river."



## Liturgical Questions.

### I.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS, &c.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be kind enough to answer the following questions in your next issue?—1. Is one at perfect liberty to begin the “Via Crucis” on the Epistle or Gospel side? 2. How many indulgences are attached to going the round of the Stations? 3. May a person in mortal sin gain them for souls in Purgatory? 4. Can nuns, &c., who have no special “Ordos” decorate the altar to their hearts’ content, and light the six candles on a week day when it is only an ordinary double, because they cherish a devotion to the saint, or because he is connected in some way with their community? When I talk of beginning the “Via Crucis,” I mean erecting the Stations of the cross. A short answer to the above will oblige.

“CLERICUS.”

1. So far as the valid erection of the Stations of the Cross is concerned, it is a matter of absolute indifference whether they proceed from the Epistle to the Gospel side, or from the Gospel to the Epistle side. Custom, against which no decree of the Pope or Congregation has ever been issued, has sanctioned both ways. Father Beringer says with regard to this question<sup>1</sup>:—“When the Way of the Cross is erected in a church or a chapel, there is no obligation of commencing the Stations at the Gospel side, so that they may terminate at the Epistle side; for the inverse arrangement is equally in use.”

2. It is impossible to determine what indulgences are attached to the devotion of the Way of the Cross; and it is strictly forbidden to proclaim from the pulpit, to state in writing, or to inscribe on the Stations themselves that a certain and defined number of indulgences can be gained by performing this devotion. The words of the Congregation of Indulgences<sup>2</sup> on this point are interesting:—

“Non publicetur ex pulpitis aut alia forma, multoque minus scribatur in aediculis sive stationibus certus et determinatus

<sup>1</sup> *Indulgences*, &c., ii<sup>e</sup> Part, ii<sup>e</sup> Section, § 2, n. 4  
*Decr. Anth.*, 100, n. 9.

numerus indulgentiarum lucrandarum, quia pluries innotuit, indulgentiarum veritatem sive ex inadvertentia aut aequivicatione, sive ex devotionis impetu alterari ac confundi; et propterea sat erit dicere quemcunque Dominicæ Passioni meditandæ hoc sancto exercitio daturum operam ex concessione Summorum Pontificum consecuturum easdem indulgentias quas consequuturum, si personaliter visitaret Stationes Viæ Crucis in Jerusalem."

According to this decree of the Congregation of Indulgence, preachers and others are to content themselves with saying that whoever performs the devotion of the Way of the Cross in a church or chapel, or other place where it is canonically erected, gains the same indulgences as he would gain were he to visit Jerusalem and perform the same devotion there. We have authority, however, for being somewhat more definite. St. Leonard of Port-Maurice, speaking of this decree, says:—

"The Congregation in issuing this decree were animated with the most prudent motives; for the documents containing the authentic records on this point having been burned in a conflagration which broke out in the Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre in the time of Pius V., it has become impossible, without danger of compromising the truth, to affirm that a certain definite number of indulgences was attached to this devotion. Let it be sufficient then for you to know that they are many and great; *and although you can gain for yourself only one plenary indulgence, it is nevertheless certain that in applying the others to the souls in Purgatory, you may hope to deliver a great number of them from their pains every time you perform this holy exercise.*"<sup>1</sup>

The natural inference from the words we have italicized is, that St. Leonard believed that several plenary indulgences are attached to this holy exercise. And what St. Leonard implies, Father Melata, one of the latest and most erudite writers on indulgences states plainly. His words are:—

"Indulgentiæ quæ per hoc exercitium acquiruntur sunt eadem quas quis lucrificeret si personaliter visitaret Stationes Viæ Crucis in Hierusalem. *Sunt autem plures tam plenariæ, quam partiales.*"

We may conclude, therefore, with Father Melata, that several plenary as well as partial indulgences may be gained by performing this devotion. And since, as the words quoted

<sup>1</sup> *Via Sacra Spianata*, page 14, apud Beringer.

from St. Leonard remind us, we can gain only one plenary indulgence for ourselves, we should always apply the remaining indulgences to the souls in Purgatory before we begin the devotion, or at least before we have finished it.

3. The only reply we can give to our correspondent's third question is that which the Congregation of Indulgences gave to the same question when proposed by the Bishop of Saint Flour; *Consulat probatos auctores*. And if he follows this counsel he will find that the authors in question are by no means agreed among themselves. Some maintain that even the sad state of mortal sin does not prevent one from being able to gain an indulgence for the souls in Purgatory, provided it be not required by the rescript granting the indulgence, or by their own nature, that the prescribed works be performed by one in the state of grace. Others contend that the state of mortal sin renders a person unable to gain any indulgence either for himself or for the souls in Purgatory. The former opinion is held by Bellarmine and Suarez, and a host of others less distinguished; while the latter finds favour with De Lugo, St. Alphonsus, and many others.

4. We see no reason for condemning the practice referred to in this question.

## II.

### THE EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—As the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for a certain number of hours during the day is becoming a common function in convents and many churches, would you state what are the rubrics prescribed for carrying it out properly?

1. Is the hymn to be sung by the choir, at such an exposition, to be the *O Salutaris* or *Pange Lingua*? 2. Whether should there be one or two incensations of the Blessed Sacrament at the exposing, and also whether one or two at the Benediction, to be given later on in the day, when only the *Tantum Ergo* may be sung? 3. If the exposition takes place in connection with a Solemn High Mass, whether ought the Blessed Sacrament be exposed *intra missam*, as at the Quarant 'Ore, or *extra missam*? 4. If the exposition takes place after a Low Mass, should the stole be of the colour of the

vestments used in the Mass—*et quatenus affirmative*, should the stole for Benediction, later on, be white? 5. May you say any prayers in the vernacular, *v.g.*, Divine Praises or Act of Reparation, before the Blessed Sacrament exposed? 6. May you preach before it when veiled with a corporal; and, if permitted, may you lawfully do so from the predella of the altar? 7. Are flowers allowed on the altar of the exposition? 8. What is the least number of wax candles allowed?

“VICE-PAROCBUS.”

The answers to most of these questions may be found in *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, in the chapters devoted to the liturgy of the worship of the Most Holy Sacrament. Here, however, we will give a brief answer to each of them.

1. The choir may sing either the *O Salutaris* or the *Pange Lingua*, or any other approved hymn, or no hymn at all. When the Blessed Sacrament is merely exposed, to remain so for some hours, it is not necessary to have music or singing, or, consequently, a choir, at the function. However, as the permission of the bishop of the place is required for such expositions, his instructions regarding ceremonies, *viz.*, prayers, hymns, music, &c., must be strictly carried out.

2. There is only one incensation of the Blessed Sacrament for mere exposition. As soon as the monstrance has been placed on the throne, the priest incenses the Blessed Sacrament, as usual, with three double swings. At Benediction there are always two incensations, provided the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament takes place after the officiant has arrived at the altar. But in the case made by our correspondent, it would seem that one incensation would suffice, as the Blessed Sacrament, in the hypothesis, had been previously exposed and incensed.

3. Such expositions as are here spoken of, being altogether extra-liturgical, are to be largely regulated by the instructions given by the bishop in permitting them. With the bishop's permission, the exposition may take place after the Communion in a Solemn, or even in a Private Mass.



But, if the bishop has not given permission for this form of exposition, then it should take place after Mass.

4. In every independent function connected with the Blessed Sacrament, except the distribution of Holy Communion—which, by the way, is regarded as not independent, but as depending on the Mass of the day—white is the colour to be used. If, then, the Blessed Sacrament be exposed *intra missam*, of course the colour is the same as that of the Mass; for in this case the exposition is not an independent function. But if the celebrant returns to the sacristy after Mass, and comes again to the altar to expose the Blessed Sacrament, the stole—and the cope, if used—should always be white, no matter what colour the feast of the day demanded. After what has now been said, it is unnecessary to add, in reply to the second part of this question, that the stole and cope used at Benediction, in the circumstances contemplated, should be white.

5. Prayers in the vernacular, if approved of by the bishop of the place, may be recited or sung in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed.<sup>1</sup> But private individuals, viz., parish priests or others, cannot select prayers at their own pleasure, and have them publicly recited, in the same circumstances.

6. It is lawful—of course with permission of the ordinary—to preach in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, though the Host be not hidden by any screen or veil; and it would be much more becoming not to use any veil, unless one of the proper material and dimensions could be had. A corporal is certainly not a proper veil. According to Cavalieri and Gavantus, the preacher may stand on the altar steps or on the predella, but should not turn his back directly to the Blessed Sacrament, unless when it is covered over with a screen, when he may turn as usual.

7. Flowers and other becoming ornaments may be placed on the altar during the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

8. The number of wax candles on the altar, when the Blessed Sacrament is publicly exposed, must be at least ten.

<sup>1</sup> See *Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions*, page 156, note 2.

## III.

## INDULGENCED CRUCIFIXES.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—The document referring to the Indulgedned Crucifixes must be read in connection with its history.

“The history, briefly, is. At the time of the *Kulturkampf*, when the Catholics of Cologne could not, without difficulty, frequent the churches to perform their favourite devotion—the *Via Crucis*, the then Archbishop, now Cardinal Melchers, applied for the privilege in question. He received it, and from that time to the present he has blessed crucifixes in such a manner, that one may obtain all the indulgences of the *Via Crucis*, by reciting the twenty Paters, Aves, and Glorias, even if one could conveniently visit a church. The privilege once conferred on him has never been retracted, but was confirmed by Leo. XIII. A letter in the *Tablet*, for the week ending November 18th, throws much light on the subject.

“Above all, the practice, actually in existence to-day in Rome, of having crucifixes so blessed, is a fact that cannot be got over.—  
Your obedient servant, “A. B.”

We gladly print this further communication from our esteemed correspondent, though we think it makes against rather than for him. For if the powers granted to Cardinal Melchers were merely intended to meet the necessities of the circumstances created by the *Kulturkampf* they could not be so ample as our correspondent claims.

Our correspondent says that these circumstances were such that “the Catholics of Cologne could not, without difficulty, frequent the churches to perform their favourite devotion—the *Via Crucis*.” Therefore, they were legitimately impeded from visiting the churches, and therefore they could gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross by using a crucifix blessed by a priest having the ordinary faculties. No need, then, for the Archbishop of Cologne to ask for and to receive extraordinary powers for blessing crucifixes.

We wish it, however, to be distinctly understood that we do not by any means wish to deny that Cardinal Melchers has the extraordinary powers claimed for him. All we have asserted, or wish to assert, is that the evidence produced does not prove that he has these powers. For aught we

know to the contrary, he may have them ; and according to the writer in the *Tablet*, to whom our correspondent refers, he actually has them ; for the writer in question assures us that he had this information from the Cardinal's own secretary. It would be interesting to know why powers were granted to Cardinal Melchers, which, as the writer in the *Tablet* states, are not exercised by the Holy Father himself. Our correspondent is, of course, of opinion that crucifixes blessed by the Holy Father have the same privileges as those blessed by Cardinal Melchers. We leave him and the writer just referred to to settle this point between them.

D. O'LOAN.

---

## Notices of Books.

---

THE POETICAL WORKS OF "LAGENIENSIS." Dublin : James Duffy & Co., Limited, 17, Wellington-quay.

OUR readers will be agreeably surprised to discover under the modest *nom-de-plume* of "Lageniensis," a writer who has won renown in other fields of learning, and who must be already an old friend of many amongst them. The admirable engraving on the frontispiece of the volume, and the neatly-written autograph beneath, reveal the secret that the author of these verses is no other than the Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, whose name has been for more than half a century intimately associated with literature, and whose *Lives of the Irish Saints* has found a place in every ecclesiastical library of importance in the kingdom. Naturally enough, therefore, curiosity will be on the tip-toe of expectation to discover what success has attended the eminent scholar and hagiologist when he has deserted his wonted sphere of prose, and ventured into the lighter, if not loftier, region of verse. Judging from the volume before us, we feel justified in asserting that the results fully justify the experiment, and that Canon O'Hanlon has achieved a success rare among men of letters—that of winning a respectable pre-eminence in both fields of literature at once.

The very name of the distinguished author is a sufficient

guarantee that there is no dearth of interest or of information in the work under review. In the introductory essays alone there is a wealth of knowledge displayed which is but seldom met with in this age of rapid reading and superficial acquirements. It is in the copious and carefully-compiled notes, however, that the learned author pours out his vast treasures of valuable information on history, on folk-lore, on popular superstitions, on the works of preceding writers who have dealt with these subjects in a manner which cannot but render his book one of the most interesting productions of contemporary literature. Stores of varied learning that has been garnered by the assiduous labours of a life-time are here spread in rich profusion before the reader, and must prove no less valuable for their intrinsic worth than for the light they shed upon the poetry which they are intended to illustrate. On this score alone the work deserves the highest praise.

But it is with the poetical merit of the writer we are now primarily concerned, and on this alone perhaps our readers are anxious to ascertain our views. We proceed to give them therefore by reviewing the principal poems of the volume as briefly as we can.

The first poem, which has well-nigh attained the dimensions of a great epic, consisting as it does of six cantos, or nearly two thousand lines, written in Spenserian verse, deals with a subject admitting of the highest poetic embellishment, and often presents graces of thought and felicitous turns of expression that prove the author's thorough conversance with the noblest poetry of the language. Its title, "*The Land of Leix: a Poem, Archæological and Descriptive*," sufficiently indicates to the student of history the nature of its contents. What "*Polyolbion*" does for England and Wales, "*The Land of Leix*" aims at doing for the picturesque scenery and interesting archæological remains of the present Queen's County. The original settlers of the district, their Druidical worship, the mission of St. Patrick amongst them, the foundation of Sletty, the church and round tower of Timahoe, the valorous conduct of Rory O'More, the wars against Essex, and various other subjects of a kindred nature, are intermingled with picturesque descriptions of the rivers, woodlands, and mountains, for which the locality is famous; nor will anyone who reads this poem deny that the distinguished author has discovered abundance of poetic material in his theme,



and has expressed it in language that lends to the land of Leix an interest it had never hitherto possessed. The historic battleground of rival factions has here assumed a new aspect, and appears to us as the shrine of sacred relics, the embodiment of varied picturesqueness, the home of chivalry and romance.

The second part of the volume is entitled "*Legend Lays of Ireland*," and expresses in poetic form, as the author informs us in his erudite preface, some tales selected from a treasury of folk-lore which is practically inexhaustible. Previous writers of eminence—Samuel Whyte, Lady Morgan, Crofton Croker, Thomas Furlong, Samuel Lover, Sir Samuel Ferguson, and others—had quarried from the same valuable mine; but abundance of wealth still remained to invite the impress of the poet's genius; and Canon O'Hanlon has selected for his intellectual mint materials admirably suited to a man of his antiquarian tastes. The contents of this portion of the work embrace the legends of Killarney, Benevenugh, Ormond Castle, Lough Rea, Culleragh, Donegal, Blarney, Aughrim, Dunamase, Holy Cross Abbey, Lough Erne, Murrisk, Saggard Hill, Blackrock, Antrim, Lough Gill, Glen of Imale, Coast of Clare, Slieve Donard, Clonenagh, Cove of Cork, and St. Mullins; and presents us with a series of charming pictures in which fairies, ghosts, and goblins, and all the other beautiful poetic creations of our wild northern superstitions, pass before us as the figures in his wierd vision did before the eyes of Macbeth. The poems are for the most part replete with life and movement, and encircle the incidents to which they give expression in all the wierd glamour of an Irish fairy-land. This is the portion of Canon O'Hanlon's poetry which we most admire, and we shall be much surprised if the verses which go to form it do not become widely popular.

The third section of the work includes the "*Buried Lady*," a strangely fantastic legend of Kilronan, Carolan's last resting-place; also a series of "*Miscellaneous Poems*" and "*Sonnets*" on a great variety of subjects. The poem on St. Vincent de Paul—possibly suggested by Gerald Griffin's "*Sister of Charity*"—is a skilfully-drawn picture of the marvels of a wonderful revelation of God's mercy towards poor suffering humanity. The lines on Dr. Lanigan are also very suggestive, and pay a well-deserved tribute of respect to the memory of one who must have been, in some respects at least, a man after Canon O'Hanlon's own heart. These and one or two other poems touch a rich vein of sympathy

in the poet's soul that reveal a wealth of tenderness which, for the most part, he seems determined to conceal. Religion, after all, is the surest touchstone of humanity.

Seeing that the merits of the volume are of such a high order, our readers may consider us hypercritical if we venture to take exception to some of the technical features of the work viewed as a series of poetical compositions. But the reputation of the author can well allow the critic to be just. The usefulness of the work does not depend on the higher graces of artistic workmanship, which poets affect so much; and Canon O'Hanlon aims at usefulness as the primary object of his labour. Our readers must not imagine, however, that the elements of pleasure are absent. There are ample proofs of a strong and active imagination, and of a fancy which seeks for resemblances beyond the beaten track of even our classical writers of prose. But when Canon O'Hanlon becomes fanciful, he not unfrequently labours under the fashionable vice of our contemporary poets—obscurity. We have read some lines again and again to discover some hidden meaning, but without success. Then there is what may be described as the depolarizing of the magnetic fervour, into which the poet sometimes works the reader; and this undesirable effect is produced, oftentimes in the most unexpected fashion, by the introduction of some commonplace incident or epithet similar to the bathos of rhetoricians. These, however, are blemishes which are often found in our greatest poets. But there are oversights—we believe them to be such—which our greatest poets would not be guilty of. We doubt if there be any authority for “was hight,” “hight” itself being already passive in meaning. Then our great poets would never allow “sëam” to rhyme with “machine,” nor “lie and” or “sky and” with “island” or “highland.” “Orison” as a rhyme with “horizon” may have Walker's authority, but certainly such a combination has never received the sanction of our best poets. These are only a few faults selected at random. They are unimportant, and we should not notice them at all, were it not that the author's scrupulous accuracy in other departments can well afford to have them pointed out as a proof that no work of human invention has ever yet been found perfect. We congratulate Canon O'Hanlon on his admirable book, and beg to express a hope that he may continue long to labour in this and the other fields of our Irish national literature, in which the harvest is so abundant, and the labourers so few.

J. J. C.

THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By the Rev. Alfred Williams Momerie, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in King's College, London. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons.

THE "other Essays" are entitled, "The Decadence of the English Church," "Ecclesiasticism," "Dogmatism in Theology," "King's College Council," "Clerical Untruthfulness," "The Drift of Religious Thought in England, and its Bearing on the Future of the English Church." The most original and interesting of those essays is that in which the Professor gives the history of his unhappy relations with the Council of King's College, where he had been Professor of Logic and Metaphysics. His first offence was a book on Inspiration, in which he made such statements as this, "There is a practically infinite difference between the God of the patriarchs, who was always repenting, and the God of the Apostles," and in which he told the following anecdote:—

"When Mr. William Smith was bringing out his *Biblical Dictionary*, being a prudent editor, and understanding the taste of the public extremely well, he determined that the articles should contain as much science as was compatible with orthodoxy, and no more. The one on the Deluge was to be written by a man whom the doctor considered safe; but when it was finished, it turned out to be quite heterodox. There was no time to procure another, as that part of the dictionary had to appear at once; so when people looked for deluge they discovered only 'see Flood.' A fresh writer was then found, but when his article was returned, it was worse than the first. It was not allowed to appear: Dr. Smith simply wrote: 'Flood: see Noah.' How he managed this article I don't know. But probably by that time, the public would stand a little more science."

The Principal of the College, Dr. Wace, considered it his duty to bring the Professor's views and conduct before the Council, not with the object of having him dismissed, but to have the question considered—Whether the theological students should be allowed to attend the lectures of the author of such a book? Dr. Momerie protested against haste, and the Principal had the matter postponed until the next ordinary meeting of the Council. In the meantime, the Professor sent copies of the objectionable book to the principal governors, who met in due course on the 12th April 1889, within "closed doors." Mr. Gladstone was there—made



the speech of the day—and was, it appears, in favour of a compromise. The Bishop of London was deputed “to talk the matter over” with the Professor. The Bishop, he tells us, called his attention, in a fatherly spirit, to the impropriety of telling “good stories,” and of taking objectionable liberties with the Bible, and represented to him that his style of preaching was calculated to damage the reputation of the College. At the next meeting of the Council it was resolved to transfer his chair from the theological to the scientific department. By this ingenious arrangement the theological students were cut off from tutorial communication with the teacher of heterodox views and the orthodoxy of the College was supposed to be maintained. A demonstration of sympathy with the Professor evidenced by letters from some of his young disciples closed the first act of this little comedy.

The author next proceeds to ask a few questions by way of reviewing the situation. The first question is not unlike that asked a short time since about the Paris Funds. “Why,” he asks, “were the public kept in ignorance of the proceedings of the Council?” It must be admitted, we think, that the Council treated the public badly in this matter—a matter which “involved the education of hundreds of future clergymen.” The next is a more inconvenient question: “Were the Council going to send out clergymen not grounded and disciplined in the practice of reasoning?” He asks, thirdly, why is it that ecclesiastics, as a rule, so passionately detest “good stories.” We were not aware of the existence of this failing, and believe it is not universal. The next question is the most pointed of all. Why were the Principal and some of the members of the Council so upset by his doctrinal statements contained in his book on Inspiration since “the supposition that the Church of England is in the main orthodox is the most curious of all delusions,” since “the majority of the clergy are heterodox;” since again “Mr. Gladstone is said to have given quotations from the fathers which showed that he was to some extent supported by those eminent antiquarian authorities.” It is unfortunate for the force of the last argument that in another part of his book the Professor states that “artifices, factions, and frauds formed the staple of the fathers’ arguments.” We shall, however, allow the Principal and some of the members, to answer the main question.

In the second act the curtain rises on the Professor unchanged, unrepentant, actually aggressive. He drops out candidly that his



chair has been of no pecuniary value since he lost the theological students who were his greatest admirers. He had intended to resign when he received a startling letter from the Principal, informing him that he, the Principal, would ask the Council to declare his chair vacant in consequence of reports of a lecture by him that appeared in the newspapers. Dr. Momerie protested against haste, not this time with so much success as on a former occasion. Neither was Mr. Gladstone so obliging this time! He wrote a very kind letter, indeed, to the Professor; but unfortunately was not well, and could not be at the next meeting of the Council. In the absence of any further suggestions of compromise, the Council, in 1891, expelled Dr. Momerie "for breaches of discipline," a convenient phrase to hide the delicate nature of his offence, which was nothing more than restating the doctrines which he had already at different times preached. A press demonstration of a mixed character brings this second act to a close.

We have given so long a summary of this essay in order to show to what straits the Anglican Church is reduced, in endeavouring to maintain a semblance of orthodoxy. The truth of the well-known dictum, that there is no logical medium between the Catholic Church and infidelity, is every day becoming more apparent. Of thinking and educated Protestants some are approaching the haven of rest in the wake of Newman and Manning; many alas! are drifting into infidelity; none are satisfied with the Thirty-nine Articles. The remaining essays of Professor Momerie leave no doubt that he has thrown off his allegiance to the Church whose music and architecture he admires, "a little of whose teaching" he still values, but which he compares to the "one-horse shay" of Oliver Wendall Holmes when it was near the collapse. With a marvellous breadth of view, he includes in one sweeping condemnation all existing forms of religion, and hopes for a "religion of the future," which will dispense with priesthood, sacrifice, and dogmatism. And this he contends will be the Christianity of Christ! The tinkling of his phrases may prevail on a few to give a hearing to this new prophet, but the individuality of his voice will soon be lost in the din of religious unbelief that ever rolls monotonously on the rock-bound shore of the Catholic Church. We commend his book to nobody except the Council of King's College and the supporters of Anglican orthodoxy.

T. P. G.







3 1262 07346 473 6

STORAGE

274.1505

I 68

ser. 3

V. ~~XIX~~



